

Peter Demosthenes Clainos, Infantry.
 John Frederick Schmelzer, Infantry.
 Sydney Dwight Grubbs, Jr., Air Corps.
 David Thomas Jellett, Infantry.
 Millard Loren Haskin, Air Corps.
 Joseph Anthony Remus, Infantry.
 Ben Harrell, Infantry.
 Richard Churchfield Blatt, Infantry.
 Richard Allen Ridsen, Infantry.
 Joseph Ermine Williams, Infantry.
 Miller Payne Warren, Jr., Infantry.
 Stanley Nelson Lonning, Infantry.
 Robert Moore Blanchard, Jr., Infantry.
 William Wilson Quinn, Infantry.
 Charner Weaver Powell, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Charles Pearce Bellican, Infantry.
 Edward Spalding Ehlen, Infantry.
 Thomas Tallant Kilday, Infantry.
 Richard Mattern Montgomery, Air Corps.
 Charles Hoffman Pottenger, Air Corps.
 John Roberts Kimmell, Jr., Infantry.
 William Vernard Thompson, Infantry.
 Gerald Carrington Simpson, Infantry.
 Robert Wilkinson Rayburn, Cavalry.
 John Baird Shinberger, Cavalry.
 Adrian Leonard Hoebeke, Infantry.

PROMOTION IN THE PHILIPPINE SCOUTS

TO BE FIRST LIEUTENANT

Emmanuel Salvador Cepeda, Philippine Scouts.

APPOINTMENT IN THE NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES

GENERAL OFFICER

Samuel Tilden Lawton to be brigadier general, National Guard of the United States.

POSTMASTERS

CALIFORNIA

James W. Barr, Big Creek.
 Lynn A. Hogue, Brea.
 Melvin L. Horine, Denair.
 Albert J. Frutchey, Los Nietos.
 Charlie M. Seargeant, Manhattan Beach.
 Talbot Bielefeldt, Placentia.
 George H. German, Port Chicago.
 Noah A. Stump, Rosemead.
 Carl A. Romer, San Juan Capistrano.
 Irene C. Witmer, Solana Beach.
 Marvin O. Drake, Terra Bella.
 Sam H. Long, Tustin.

LOUISIANA

Raleigh Leslie Wyble, Melville.

MASSACHUSETTS

Richard Mullen, Athol.
 Mary G. Haniffin, Belchertown.
 Hazel M. Cairns, Bernardston.
 Fred C. Small, Buzzards Bay.
 Patrick H. Haley, Chelmsford.
 Leon H. Thorner, Clifton.
 James J. Murtaugh, Hopkinton.
 William M. Higgins, Jr., Orleans.
 Ethyl M. Duffey, Scituate.
 Maryetta Browne, State Farm.
 Bertha M. West, Wianno.

NEVADA

Isaac L. Stone, McGill.

NEW YORK

Mattie C. Dellone, Bolivar.
 John F. McGovern, Caledonia.
 Jesse B. Kilburn, Cattaraugus.
 Michael O'Donnell, Cohoes.
 Raymond A. Switzer, Ebenezer.
 Arthur H. Walsh, Garrison.
 David J. McHenry, Granville.

Frederick W. Schadt, Jeffersonville.
 Ray G. Blyth, Macedon.
 Frank B. Rickard, Middleburg.
 Gertrude F. Tracey, Middleport.
 John Francis Dawson, Mineville.
 James P. Doyle, Nunda.
 Thomas A. Kenney, Ossining.
 Lewis N. S. Rockwell, Otisville.
 Herbert N. Griffin, Oxford.
 Edward H. O'Connor, Sherburne.
 Walter F. Herrling, Skaneateles.

NORTH CAROLINA

John G. Kennedy, Beulaville.
 Helen H. Leggett, Scotland Neck.
 Samuel R. Fowle, Jr., Washington.

OHIO

Michael A. Delsantro, Willoughby.

OKLAHOMA

Roy C. Bennett, Vian.

OREGON

Glen A. Henderson, Houlton.
 Inez C. Givan, Merrill.

VERMONT

Helen F. McKenna, Norwich.
 Harold J. Sheehan, Richmond.
 George M. Goodrich, South Royalton.

WYOMING

Arthur W. Crawford, Guernsey.

WITHDRAWAL

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate May 8 (legislative day of Apr. 24), 1936

POSTMASTER

ARKANSAS

Edgar L. Adams to be postmaster at Stephens, in the State of Arkansas.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, MAY 8, 1936

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Lord and our Father, O satisfy us with Thy mercy, that we may rejoice and be glad all our days. Let Thy work appear unto Thy servants and Thy glory unto their children. We unite in a national tribute to mother. Hear us in these moments of praise and grateful retrospection. We rejoice that hers was the first face that brightened at our joys and wept at our tears. It was the first face on which divine love wrote its immortal message; it gave all and asked nothing. We thank Thee for the paths of childhood, where she first placed our wandering feet. We pray that her heavenly, sacrificial spirit may hover over our land. Then strife will cease, brotherly love will take the place of hatred, and men will follow the Golden Rule. We bless Thee, Almighty God, for her wonderful memory. May it abide with us as the inspiration of virtue, sacrifice, and religion, and unto Thee be praises forever. Through Christ. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on May 7, 1936, the President approved and signed bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 5491. An act for the relief of Bethlehem Fabricators, Inc.;

H. R. 9380. An act for the relief of Edgar M. Barber, special disbursing agent, Paris, France, and Leo Martinuzzi, former customs clerk; and

H. R. 10193. An act to amend the act to fix the hours of duty of postal employees.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Horne, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 11098. An act to provide for terms of the United States District Court for the Middle District of Pennsylvania to be held at Wilkes-Barre, Pa.; and

H. R. 11994. An act to provide for the establishment of a term of the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Oklahoma at Shawnee, Okla.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments, in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 8287. An act to establish an assessed valuation real-property tax in the Virgin Islands of the United States.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed joint resolutions of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. J. Res. 226. Joint resolution authorizing the President to invite foreign countries to participate in the San Francisco Bay Exposition of 1939 at San Francisco, Calif.;

S. J. Res. 229. Joint resolution providing for the contribution by the United States to the expense of the celebration by the State of Arkansas of its admission to the Federal Union; and

S. J. Res. 260. Joint resolution to provide an additional appropriation for folding speeches and pamphlets for the Senate for the fiscal year 1936.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1075. An act for the relief of Louis H. Cordis;

S. 3645. An act for the relief of Dampskib Aktieselskab Roskva;

S. 3685. An act for the relief of George Rabcinski; and

S. 4395. An act for the relief of the State of New Jersey.

The message also announced that the Senate had ordered that the Secretary be directed to request the House to return to the Senate the bill (S. 4353) to provide for the establishment of a term of the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Oklahoma at Shawnee, Okla.

THE FRAZIER-LEMKE BILL

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, on Monday next, May 11, 1936, the so-called Frazier-Lemke bill comes before the House.

The parliamentary procedure is as follows:

Under clause 4 of rule XXVII, the so-called "discharge rule", immediately after the approval of the Journal, and before any other business can be transacted, the Speaker must recognize any Member who signed the petition to discharge to call up the motion to discharge.

The resolution, H. Res. 123, is then read by title only. The title is, "To make H. R. 2066, a bill to liquidate and re-finance agricultural indebtedness at a reduced rate of interest by establishing an efficient credit system through the use of the Farm Credit Administration, the Federal Reserve banking system, and creating a Board of Agriculture to supervise the same, a special order of business."

After 20 minutes' debate, one-half in favor of the motion to discharge and one-half in opposition thereto, the House proceeds to vote on the motion to discharge the Rules Committee.

If the motion prevails, the House immediately votes on the adoption of the resolution, H. Res. 123.

If the resolution or "rule" is adopted, the bill H. R. 2066, under the provisions of the rule is taken up on the next day, Tuesday, May 12, 1936, for consideration under the general rules of the House, except that general debate, confined to the bill, is limited to 6 hours, and except that the time is controlled, one-half by the Member requesting the rule for the consideration of said H. R. 2066, which probably means the introducer of H. Res. 123, the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. LEMKE], and the 3 hours in opposition is controlled by some Member of the House opposed to the bill, to be designated by the Speaker. If the first two votes, to discharge the Rules Committee and the adoption of the rule prevail, the consideration of the bill under general debate and the amendments will undoubtedly consume 2 or 3 days. Final vote on the bill, in all likelihood would come late Wednesday or on Thursday.

The Frazier-Lemke bill, H. R. 2066, was introduced in the House by the Republican Member from North Dakota [Mr. LEMKE] on January 3, 1935, and about the same time introduced in the Senate by the Republican Senator from that State [Mr. FRAZIER].

The rule, H. Res. 123, was introduced in the House by Mr. LEMKE on February 21, 1935, before the Agriculture Committee of the House had acted on the bill, and the rule is extraordinary in that it was not directed toward the Agriculture Committee, but provided for the consideration of the bill notwithstanding any further action on the said bill by the Committee on Agriculture, "or any rule of the House."

The rule is further most extraordinary in that it directs whom the Speaker shall recognize to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, namely, Mr. LEMKE, the introducer, a minority Member, who is not a member of the Agriculture Committee, nor the Member who filed the motion to discharge at the Speaker's desk. Mr. LEMKE was the fortieth signer on the said petition.

Furthermore, the rule is most extraordinary in that time under general debate is directed to be controlled in support of the bill by Mr. LEMKE, a Member of the minority, contrary to the standing practice in the House, for many years, that time in general debate is controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the reporting committee. In this novel practice the control of the proceedings of the House during the consideration of this bill is in the hands of a minority Member and the majority of the House, of about 3 to 1 to the minority, is out of control.

The bill, H. R. 2066, was reported out of the Agriculture Committee of the House on May 3, 1935. Nothing whatsoever has been done in reference to calling up the companion bill in the Senate and there is no indication that any effort has been made or will be made in that direction.

The bill could have been called up in the House in the regular course of its proceedings on Calendar Wednesday, May 15, 1935, 12 days after it was reported out of the Committee on Agriculture. That committee had the call on that day and had all of the day, if it had desired to use it. The Committee on Agriculture, however, waived its right to the day and no proponents of the Frazier-Lemke bill, including Mr. LEMKE, objected to that waiver.

It has always been impossible to find out how many, or what particular members, of the Committee of Agriculture voted to report the bill. No record vote was taken. Sometime thereafter the committee did vote, without any record vote, to request the Rules Committee to grant a rule for the consideration of the bill and thereupon appointed a subcommittee of two members to wait upon the Rules Committee to request a hearing on the application for a rule. It is most extraordinary that this subcommittee consisted of two Republicans, and to date no Democratic member of that committee has ever requested a hearing before the Rules Committee.

The invariable practice has been that the chairman of a standing committee or some majority member designated by him, makes the request to Rules Committee for a hearing.

When the request was made to the chairman of the Rules Committee by the two minority members, they were informed that in view of the peculiar circumstances and the reputed rumors that the Agriculture Committee had passed the "buck" to the Rules Committee, as was stated in the meeting when the bill was reported out, the chairman of the Rules Committee, after consultation with the leaders of the House, took the position that the request for a hearing should be made by a majority of the members of the Committee on Agriculture, and that if such majority joined in such a request, a hearing would be granted. That normal situation has been a standing offer to the Agriculture Committee as is known by the proponents of the bill but has never yet been complied with.

On March 5, 1935, within 12 days after the introduction of the rule, H. Res. 123, a petition was filed at the Speaker's desk to discharge the Rules Committee from further consideration of the rule. This was 2 months before the Agriculture Committee acted on the bill. Rules Committee has never considered a rule for the consideration of any bill which has not been reported out of a committee.

On April 30, 1936, the petition was completed with 218 signatures, including three Members now dead, and one Member who has never voted during this session of Congress. Under a decision by former Speaker Rainey, the signatures of deceased Members are permitted to remain on the petition.

The Frazier-Lemke bill is a proposal that the Government take over the mortgages on the farms of the country. It is estimated that they amount to about eight and one-half billion dollars. The bill provides that these mortgages be taken over at their face value, and at an interest rate of 1½ percent. Furthermore, the bill applies to any farmer who may have lost his property through foreclosure in the last 14 years. These mortgages are principally held by the insurance companies of the country. The effect of the bill would be that the Government would bail out the insurance companies of the country of billions of dollars of their loans.

The bill is strictly a "farm" bill with no provision to take care of urban or city mortgages, which amount to \$21,000,000,000, as compared to the farm mortgages of eight and one-half billion dollars. It is true that through the Home Owners' Loan Corporation about two and one-half billion dollars has been loaned to city dwellers, but on a valuation not to exceed 80 percent and practically does not exceed 60 percent, and further at an interest rate of 5 percent.

There is absolutely no possibility of providing in this bill for any relief for the city mortgagors. It is beyond question that any amendment attempted to take care of city mortgages would be held not germane and ruled out on a point of order, because the Frazier-Lemke bill pertains solely to farm mortgages.

The chief objection to the Frazier-Lemke bill is, however, that it is an inflationary measure rather than a "farm relief" bill. The inflation feature, of providing for the printing of \$3,000,000,000 of currency, just as a start, to finance the taking over of the farm mortgages, is the chief feature of the bill and because such an inflationary measure is the prime purpose of the bill, it should have been referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency rather than the Committee on Agriculture.

The Members of the House from the metropolitan areas have always supported every genuine farm-relief measure, and if this inflationary feature was not in the bill, in spite of the discrimination against the cities, many of the Members from the cities, including myself, would feel inclined to support the bill.

Organized labor is definitely opposed to the bill as publicly stated by Mr. William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, because of its inflationary provisions, which would inevitably increase the cost of living and consequently decrease the purchasing power of the wage earner.

The farmers of this country, who with all their dependents number less than 25 percent of the population, have received

especial and preferential treatment at the hands of the Government. Only on last Monday, May 4, 1936, there was passed in the House, on the Consent Calendar, H. R. 10101, introduced by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gillett] and reported by the Committee on Agriculture, "A bill to amend the Federal Farm Loan Act and the Farm Credit Act of 1935", extending for 2 years the interest on loans on farm mortgages at a rate of 3½ percent. Again this relief can be contrasted with the Government rate on city mortgages of 5 percent. This bill, H. R. 10101, in itself should be sufficient to take care of the situation as to farm mortgages.

Furthermore, there is pending on the Union Calendar, No. 223, H. R. 7593, introduced by Mr. Jones of Texas, chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, a well-considered bill which should accomplish anything further needed to be done for the farmer beyond the Gillette bill.

H. R. 7593 is "a bill to facilitate the extension of agricultural credit at lower interest rates by providing for the issue of certain bank notes, and for other purposes." Again, unfortunately, however, this bill cannot be offered as an amendment to the Frazier-Lemke bill, because it is not germane and would be ruled out on a point of order, and it is well known that the proponents of the Frazier-Lemke bill will oppose any amendment offered to their measure.

The Frazier-Lemke bill is the first definite step in inflation yet taken by this Government, and is supported by a number of Members solely because it is an inflationary measure and not because it is a "farm bill." Its accomplishment would be ruinous to over 75 percent of the population of this country and especially to the wage earners in the cities.

It is for the above reason that the consideration of the bill has been opposed, and the sane, conservative, patriotic way to oppose it is to vote against it from the very start, by opposing the first vote taken on Monday, May 11, 1936, to discharge the Rules Committee.

INTERNATIONAL PETROLEUM EXPOSITION, TULSA, OKLA.

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Joint Resolution 497, to permit articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the International Petroleum Exposition, Tulsa, Okla., to be admitted without payment of tariff, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oklahoma asks unanimous consent for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 497, of which the Clerk will read the title.

The Clerk read the title.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. SNELL. Reserving the right to object, I suppose this is the usual resolution that we have been passing when a certain part of the country desired an exposition.

Mr. DISNEY. That is correct.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

House Joint Resolution 497

Resolved, etc., That all articles which shall be imported from foreign countries for exhibition at the International Petroleum Exposition to be held at Tulsa, Okla., from May 16 to May 23, 1936, or for use in constructing, installing, or maintaining foreign buildings or exhibits at the said exposition upon which articles there shall be a tariff or customs duty shall be admitted without payment of such tariff, customs duty, fees, or charges under such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe; but it shall be lawful at any time during or within 3 months after the close of the said exposition to sell within the area of the exposition any articles provided for herein, subject to such regulations for the security of the revenue and for the collection of import duties as the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe: *Provided*, That all such articles, when withdrawn for consumption or use in the United States, shall be subject to the duties, if any, imposed upon such articles by the revenue laws in force at the date of their withdrawal; and on such articles, which shall have suffered diminution or deterioration from incidental handling or exposure, the duties, if payable, shall be assessed according to the appraised value at the time of withdrawal from entry hereunder for consumption or entry under the general tariff law: *Provided further*, That imported articles provided for herein shall not be

subject to any marking requirements of the general tariff laws, except when such articles are withdrawn for consumption or use in the United States, in which case they shall not be released from customs custody until properly marked, but no additional duty shall be assessed because such articles were not sufficiently marked when imported into the United States: *Provided further*, That at any time during or within 3 months after the close of the exposition any article entered hereunder may be abandoned to the Government or destroyed under customs supervision, whereupon any duties on such article shall be remitted: *Provided further*, That articles, which have been admitted without payment of duty for exhibition under any tariff law and which have remained in continuous customs custody or under a customs exhibition bond, and imported articles in bonded warehouses under the general tariff law may be accorded the privilege of transfer to and entry for exhibition at the said exposition under such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe: *And provided further*, That the International Petroleum Exposition shall be deemed, for customs purposes only, to be the sole consignee of all merchandise imported under the provisions of this act, and that the actual and necessary customs charges for labor, services, and other expenses in connection with the entry, examination, appraisement, release, or custody, together with the necessary charges for salaries of customs officers and employees in connection with the supervision, custody of, and accounting for, articles imported under the provisions of this act, shall be reimbursed by the International Petroleum Exposition to the Government of the United States under regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury, and that receipts from such reimbursements shall be deposited as refunds to the appropriation from which paid, in the manner provided for in section 524, Tariff Act of 1930.

Mr. TREADWAY. This is simply to permit the importation of certain articles without the payment of duty provided they come in bond.

Mr. DISNEY. Yes; and if they are sold they pay the regular duty.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE DEFICIENCY BILL OF 1936

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 12624) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1936, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1936, and June 30, 1937, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with Mr. McCORMACK in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY].

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, it is not my purpose this morning to enter into any special discussion of the particular provisions of the pending bill. What I want to do if I can is to make a few remarks in the nature of suggestions for my colleagues to think about in the future conduct of the business of this country and for their use in the future action of the Congress.

I have always believed that the Government, like an individual, should live within its income. I think that is as fundamental and sound a principle of economics as any that we may discuss. I think also that the simple things I am going to say are as fundamental as simple, and that, as I understand it, the deficiency appropriation bill is a bill to provide for the payment of indebtedness incurred by Government bureaus in excess of what Congress has heretofore authorized.

It is my information from the membership of the Appropriations Committee that this bill carries a rather small amount of what is, in fact, a deficiency obligation. Stated in another way it is this: We, the Congress, say you can spend so much, and the various departments go ahead without

regard to what we have said and spend several millions more, and then come back and say to us we have spent more than you directed and have a deficiency in our departments and you must allow us that, and that continues from year to year, and that is how we get deficiencies. That is what causes deficits. The Government spends more than the taxes that are collected. It is true in this bill, however, that the major portion of more than \$2,000,000,000 is for relief. I am convinced—and I think the membership of this House is convinced—that there ought to be a stopping place somewhere in the matter of appropriations and expenditures. There are just two ends, you might say, to the business of the Federal Government—one is the intake end and the other is the discharge end. One is the end that represents receipts and the other is the end that represents disbursements; and when the time comes that receipts are far less than disbursements, we have what we call an unbalanced Budget, or a deficit. The same thing can happen to my bank account and to your bank account, provided the bankers are liberal enough to allow us to overdraw; and just as sure as we overdraw our bank accounts, we impair our credit; and when the Federal Government continuously follows a system of overdrafts or deficits or unbalanced budgets, whatever you choose to call them, it continues to that extent to impair its credit.

Mr. COLDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. Yes.

Mr. COLDEN. The gentleman is emphasizing the necessity of keeping within the revenues of the Government and mentions the individual. When an individual has sickness in his family, or an emergency, he is compelled by the circumstances to go out and borrow money, regardless of his income. Is not that the situation of the United States Government? We have been sick economically and it has been necessary for us to make these expenditures.

Mr. MAY. The Government or the country has been, indeed, very sick, but the Government has practically recovered from its sickness and is now out on the high plane of good health, in the sunshine, and able to walk, and the time has come when the medical bills must cease, and the time has come when the Government ought to begin to provide against such contingencies as getting sick as it has in the past. One of the best ways in the world to do that is to practice economy when we ought to practice it, so that when the sick spell does come we will have a balance sufficient in the Treasury to take care of the sickness. In other words, practice economy and lay up something for a rainy day. The prudent man will not wait till he is sick but will commence to save while he is able to work.

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. Yes.

Mr. PIERCE. I agree with that 100 percent. Is not the question of the unemployed, which is making this bill necessary in all its largeness, the real cause, and is not that a permanent feature in this country?

Mr. MAY. Unemployment is a problem, but I am not willing to believe the statements of one of the chief witnesses as a proponent of this bill on two propositions; I think he is simply uninformed and I do not ascribe to him any ulterior motive. I do not believe unemployment in this country is as bad as we are told it is, and I do not believe there are 20,000,000 American people who ought to have relief, because there are not that many that have to have relief, and I think relief ought to be restricted to those who meritoriously need relief, and everybody knows there are thousands on relief rolls that are not entitled to be on them.

Mr. PIERCE. Should we not cut our cloth to suit our needs? And I agree with the gentleman fully that we should pay as we go, and if I return here in the next Congress I shall vote on that line, regardless of party lines. Nevertheless, should not we at once prepare to take care of the unemployed who cannot get work?

Mr. MAY. I agree with the gentleman that we must make it possible for the unemployed to get work, and I shall vote

accordingly; but there is only one way to stop Government expenditures that are neither wise nor necessary, and that is to stop making unnecessary appropriations for unnecessary activities of the Government. The Government of the United States is engaged in things today that the Members of this Congress do not know it is engaged in. Frequently we hear criticism of some of our Members on the floor of this House who talk a great deal—and I am not one of them, I thank the Lord. They are charged with putting the Government to the expense of \$50 a page in printing the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Yet in 1935, by an act of July 26, Public, 220—and I am using this as an illustration of what we are doing unconsciously—we created a Federal Register, providing for the publication daily of the proclamations and executive orders of all the executive departments and the rules and regulations of the various bureaus of the Government. The purpose of that was to let the people of the country know what kind of laws they had to obey; in other words, not the acts of Congress but the downtown laws of the city of Washington. That is what it is, and here we have a Register published up to date, beginning on March 14 of this year, 6 days less than 2 months old, which is costing the taxpayers of the country \$30 a page to print, and I have in my hand volume 1, no. 40. The page has reached 406 up to date, which, at \$30 a page, amounts to \$12,360 in 2 months.

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. Yes.

Mr. WOODRUM. I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that in one breath he complains about the fact that the Government is doing things that the people do not know anything about and in the next breath he complains about the only official organ that does tell the Congress and the country what the rules and the regulations and edicts of the Government are.

Mr. MAY. The point I make is that we ought not to have as many bureaus as we have and we ought not to have as many rules and regulations as we have, and we will continue to have them just so long as we appropriate ten and a half billion dollars at each session of Congress. My good friend, Mr. WOODRUM, comes from the great State of Virginia. He is a Democrat and a real statesman, and I am proud of the honor of being his colleague in this great body. No doubt he is familiar with the teachings of the Father of Democracy, the immortal Jefferson, a citizen of his own State, author of the Declaration of Independence, Governor of Virginia, writer of the Virginia Statutes of Religious Liberty, Ambassador to France, twice President of the United States, founder of the University of Virginia, statesman, and philosopher; and may I remind my colleague that it was he that said, "The least governed was the best governed", and he also said, "If the day ever comes that we must look to Washington for direction as to when to sow and when to reap, we shall surely want for bread." That is the doctrine I am contending for.

Mr. WOODRUM. I agree with that; but my friend is a good lawyer and an able and helpful Member of this House. I want to ask him this question—

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Kentucky 2 additional minutes.

Mr. MAY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. WOODRUM. The gentleman will remember the occasion for the establishment of the Federal Register, which was the decision of the Supreme Court in the "hot oil" case, where it developed that people had been brought into court and tried for offenses which were not in violation of the law because some department had changed its rules and regulations and nobody knew anything about it until after the conviction. The Supreme Court criticized this system. Does not the gentleman think that where there are departments like the Bureau of Internal Revenue, the tax department, and other departments of the Government that do have au-

thority under the law to promulgate important rules and regulations, there ought to be some way that those rules and regulations could be collected, annotated, and disseminated? Perhaps this is too elaborate. Perhaps this should be cut down to a weekly publication or some other system, but should there not be some method of giving to the Congress and to the people and to the citizens definite and authentic information as to the activities of departments in that respect?

Mr. MAY. I am in favor of giving the people all the information they desire, and if we follow the teachings of Jefferson, the people will not need all this instruction, neither will we have to go to jail. Congress ought to make the laws and not the bureaus, and the courts, and not the bureaus, ought to enforce them. I called the Bureau of Archives this morning and talked to the director of this publication. He told me that although the subscription is \$10 a year, the subscription list to date has not reached 500, and that the only people who received it free were heads of bureaus and Members of the Congress of the United States.

The point I am trying to make is this, that just as surely as you give men money to spend, they will spend it, and until we reach a point where we can begin to cut out some of these agencies—and I think Congress is in humor to cut them out—and I think they should be cut out, I think every emergency organization that has been set up should be abolished just as soon as it can be done. I find authority for that in the last Democratic platform. I believe in being a Democrat. I am in thorough sympathy with the President of the United States in his determined effort to rescue this country from the terrible depression, and everybody here knows that under his wise and patriotic leadership we have emerged from the depths of depression and are back again to sound and lasting prosperity; but I say when the war is over and peace has been declared, we ought to stop mobilizing armies and undertake true economy. [Applause.] There must be a stopping place. There will be a stopping place, and unless Congress again assumes its legitimate functions under the Constitution that stopping place will be either bankruptcy or inflation in an uncontrollable form, and one is the equivalent of the other. The mere fact that we have during the Seventy-fourth Congress appropriated and authorized the expenditure of more than \$20,000,000,000 is a general invitation to the bureaucrats to expect and demand more. There is only one place to stop it, and that is right here on the floor of this House. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. THURSTON].

Mr. THURSTON. Mr. Chairman, the subcommittee in charge of this bill held hearings covering a period of about 6 weeks, during which time approximately 2,000 pages of hearings were accumulated. So it is obvious that one Member could not discuss the many phases of this measure in detail.

At the outset, I desire to comment just briefly on the composition of the bill. As you know, there are two main sections, one which deals with the deficiencies of the regular departments of the Government. The items carried in this section total approximately \$938,000,000.

Then, the more important and controversial division in regard to relief, which carries \$1,425,000,000, making an aggregate sum of \$2,364,000,000. It seems to me it would have been much better if two separate bills could have been brought in so that relief could have been discussed separately and free from departmental askings of the other portions of the bill.

Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer in this connection a table on page 6 of the hearings of the Deficiency Subcommittee on Appropriations which shows the type of project included in the \$1,425,000,000 portion of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered. There was no objection.

The table referred to is as follows:

Type of project	Amount	Percent
Highways, roads, and streets.....	\$413,250,000	29
Public buildings.....	156,750,000	11
Parks and other recreational facilities.....	156,750,000	11
Public utilities, including sewer systems, water supply and purification, airports, and other transportation facilities.....	171,000,000	12
Flood control and other conservation.....	128,250,000	9
White-collar projects.....	85,500,000	6
Women's projects.....	85,500,000	6
Miscellaneous work projects.....	71,250,000	5
National Youth Administration.....	71,250,000	5
Rural rehabilitation and relief to farmers.....	85,500,000	6
Total.....	1,425,000,000	100

Mr. THURSTON. Mr. Chairman, there are just two general phases that I desire to touch upon. One is the question

as to whether or not there is political interference in the distribution of relief and a proposal to correct this evil, and the other is the contribution that has been made, or should be made, by respective States.

In regard to the contribution that has been made by the Federal Government, supplemented by either State or subdivisions of State governments, I desire to offer in this connection table no. 4 of the hearings, which gives in detail the amount of funds granted by the Federal Government and each State, plus the amount contributed by each State government; also table no. 8, "Allocation relief funds by States", and table no. 23, "Relief grants."

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The table referred to is as follows:

TABLE E-4.—Amount of obligations incurred for emergency relief,¹ by sources of funds by States, January 1933 through December 1935

State	Total amount	Federal funds		State funds		Local funds	
		Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent
Alabama.....	\$47,319,991	\$44,764,187	94.7	\$312,212	0.6	\$2,243,592	4.7
Arizona.....	18,991,968	16,170,500	85.2	2,437,919	12.8	383,549	2.0
Arkansas.....	41,527,083	40,057,358	96.5	305,135	.7	1,164,590	2.8
California.....	236,085,257	158,043,636	67.2	38,206,236	16.3	38,845,385	16.5
Colorado.....	46,664,441	39,410,024	84.5	2,117,412	4.5	5,137,005	11.0
Connecticut.....	53,526,634	23,514,387	43.9	5,300,393	9.9	24,711,854	46.2
Delaware.....	5,194,724	2,103,756	40.5	2,107,943	40.6	983,025	18.9
District of Columbia.....	20,012,870	14,665,529	73.3			5,347,341	26.7
Florida.....	42,376,988	40,361,152	95.3	15,492	(¹)	2,000,344	4.7
Georgia.....	48,205,248	45,645,693	94.7	5	(¹)	2,559,550	5.3
Idaho.....	15,883,654	13,359,320	84.1	806,612	5.1	1,717,722	10.8
Illinois.....	308,672,761	232,791,591	75.4	62,119,848	20.1	13,761,322	4.5
Indiana.....	80,310,882	51,864,560	64.6	164,636	.2	28,281,686	35.2
Iowa.....	41,764,128	24,140,511	57.8	4,169,753	10.0	13,453,864	32.2
Kansas.....	54,745,989	39,949,490	73.0	470,877	.9	14,325,622	26.1
Kentucky.....	45,139,766	39,180,712	86.8	2,273,998	5.0	3,685,056	8.2
Louisiana.....	53,106,478	51,475,311	96.9	1,697	(¹)	1,629,470	3.1
Maine.....	23,300,439	11,788,629	50.6	2,087,142	9.0	9,424,668	40.4
Maryland.....	45,915,982	33,349,284	72.6	10,127,287	22.1	2,439,411	5.3
Massachusetts.....	218,642,854	114,510,390	52.3	560,381	.3	103,572,083	47.1
Michigan.....	172,956,375	127,200,760	73.5	26,453,278	15.3	19,302,337	11.2
Minnesota.....	68,656,403	67,777,773	76.4	5,462,092	6.2	15,416,538	17.4
Mississippi.....	32,269,711	31,028,139	96.4	208,334	.6	1,023,238	3.2
Missouri.....	82,112,369	63,446,081	77.3	9,001,277	10.9	9,665,011	11.8
Montana.....	25,586,536	22,691,295	88.7	451,220	1.8	2,444,021	9.5
Nebraska.....	28,091,783	21,583,108	76.8	2,748	(¹)	6,505,927	23.2
Nevada.....	5,724,742	5,074,574	88.6	130,489	2.3	519,679	9.1
New Hampshire.....	12,299,612	5,493,617	44.7	3,664,360	29.8	3,141,635	25.5
New Jersey.....	138,413,434	94,725,916	68.4	32,832,756	23.7	10,854,762	7.9
New Mexico.....	15,269,713	14,738,853	96.5	351,293	2.3	179,567	1.2
New York.....	726,682,824	385,599,738	53.0	125,445,318	17.3	215,637,768	29.7
North Carolina.....	39,654,693	38,401,514	96.8			1,253,179	3.2
North Dakota.....	28,802,104	24,856,992	86.3	41,938	.2	3,903,174	13.5
Ohio.....	219,470,509	170,537,836	77.7	33,017,460	15.0	15,915,213	7.3
Oklahoma.....	51,874,144	45,052,578	86.8	364,784	.7	6,456,782	12.5
Oregon.....	27,719,065	22,019,711	79.4	2,582,764	9.3	3,116,600	11.3
Pennsylvania.....	446,374,260	316,686,347	70.9	104,695,574	23.5	24,992,339	5.6
Rhode Island.....	20,197,308	7,947,266	39.4	5,299,281	26.2	6,950,761	34.4
South Carolina.....	36,614,918	35,867,760	98.0	1,324	(¹)	745,834	2.0
South Dakota.....	35,957,209	32,301,066	89.8			3,656,143	10.2
Tennessee.....	36,897,618	34,449,852	93.4	893,324	2.4	1,554,442	4.2
Texas.....	97,152,411	76,693,808	78.9	19,412,655	20.0	1,045,948	1.1
Utah.....	25,041,740	19,754,620	78.9	3,370,051	13.4	1,917,069	7.7
Vermont.....	6,013,946	3,406,100	56.6	39,845	.7	2,568,001	42.7
Virginia.....	26,358,205	23,779,228	90.2	34,452	.1	2,544,525	9.7
Washington.....	48,890,429	39,965,183	81.7	5,919,721	12.1	3,005,525	6.2
West Virginia.....	57,334,951	30,758,080	53.6	5,016,987	8.8	1,559,884	2.7
Wisconsin.....	109,903,757	79,672,626	72.5	4,234,317	3.9	25,996,814	23.6
Wyoming.....	7,724,461	7,044,855	91.2	267,039	3.5	412,567	5.3
Total, United States.....	4,096,433,367	2,905,701,296	70.9	522,779,649	12.8	667,952,422	16.3

¹ Includes obligations incurred for relief extended under the general relief program, under all special programs, and for administration; beginning April 1934 these figures also include purchases of materials, supplies, and equipment, rentals of equipment (such as team and truck hire) earnings of nonrelief persons employed and other expenses incident to the Emergency Work Relief Program.

² Less than one-tenth of 1 percent.

TABLE A-8.—Allocation of funds provided under Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1935, by agencies and by States, through Mar. 31, 1936

(Warrants approved)				
State or Territory	Grand total	Works Progress Administration	Emergency Conservation Work	All other operating agencies, exclusive of Works Progress Administration and Emergency Conservation Work
Total.....	\$4,508,412,285	\$1,363,926,901	\$527,479,450	\$2,617,005,934
Alabama.....	64,446,977	17,421,545	9,000,000	38,025,432
Arizona.....	37,921,823	5,198,424	12,345,500	20,377,899
Arkansas.....	59,830,101	14,366,301	11,100,000	34,353,800
California.....	269,228,356	77,061,694	26,943,499	166,223,163
Colorado.....	58,961,687	17,863,127	8,092,000	33,006,560
Connecticut.....	38,996,427	14,026,505	4,600,000	20,369,922
Delaware.....	7,043,767	1,645,972	2,100,000	3,297,795
District of Columbia.....	24,488,834	6,594,933	1,469,388	16,424,513
Florida.....	60,156,797	14,789,117	6,013,100	39,354,580
Georgia.....	68,423,966	19,116,876	12,553,233	36,753,857
Idaho.....	33,711,106	4,862,907	12,399,500	16,448,699
Illinois.....	241,365,688	85,387,356	18,725,000	137,253,332
Indiana.....	86,566,102	40,040,009	10,000,000	36,526,093
Iowa.....	46,958,400	12,968,713	7,108,530	26,881,157
Kansas.....	56,029,798	16,327,388	5,677,500	34,024,910
Kentucky.....	62,851,211	18,949,291	12,700,000	31,201,920
Louisiana.....	53,820,041	17,052,315	9,500,000	27,267,726
Maine.....	26,947,502	4,743,244	4,100,000	18,104,258
Maryland.....	53,447,970	11,179,104	7,600,000	34,668,866
Massachusetts.....	149,407,527	50,670,372	12,000,000	86,737,155
Michigan.....	135,751,398	45,070,145	17,105,000	73,576,253
Minnesota.....	95,099,363	29,677,101	16,467,655	48,954,607
Mississippi.....	48,107,390	11,227,113	10,002,500	26,877,767
Missouri.....	98,882,133	32,557,031	10,500,000	55,825,102
Montana.....	55,162,689	7,365,238	7,370,000	40,411,451
Nebraska.....	49,019,832	10,206,349	5,578,500	33,234,983
Nevada.....	12,103,165	1,393,762	3,970,000	6,739,403
New Hampshire.....	13,978,178	3,589,440	4,700,000	5,688,738
New Jersey.....	120,792,564	45,386,890	9,000,000	66,405,674
New Mexico.....	39,822,407	5,556,104	10,789,500	23,476,803
New York.....	548,965,954	259,734,795	25,040,000	264,191,159

TABLE A-8.—Allocation of funds provided under Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1935, by agencies and by States, through Mar. 31, 1936—Continued

(Warrants approved)				
State or Territory	Grand total	Works Progress Administration	Emergency Conservation Work	All other operating agencies, exclusive of Works Progress Administration and Emergency Conservation Work
North Carolina.....	\$57,946,689	\$12,174,890	\$12,575,000	\$33,196,799
North Dakota.....	31,639,395	5,282,211	3,657,500	22,699,684
Ohio.....	221,539,879	91,018,680	13,000,000	117,521,199
Oklahoma.....	77,516,000	26,285,339	11,059,945	40,170,716
Oregon.....	41,951,111	8,970,369	11,406,800	21,573,942
Pennsylvania.....	317,721,910	123,431,402	83,700,000	160,590,508
Rhode Island.....	16,768,548	6,658,024	1,800,000	8,310,524
South Carolina.....	46,413,085	9,240,333	9,300,000	27,872,752
South Dakota.....	32,591,453	6,019,019	6,063,350	20,509,084
Tennessee.....	68,939,257	15,102,526	14,000,000	39,836,731
Texas.....	166,310,825	34,967,881	18,160,000	113,182,944
Utah.....	28,910,252	6,961,844	6,203,500	15,744,908
Vermont.....	15,879,899	2,146,025	8,800,000	4,933,874
Virginia.....	57,370,734	11,665,941	16,500,000	29,174,793
Washington.....	85,206,559	17,193,235	12,394,000	55,619,324
West Virginia.....	63,957,213	21,476,388	10,200,000	32,280,825
Wisconsin.....	98,307,120	30,697,576	16,395,500	51,214,044
Wyoming.....	26,750,498	2,798,526	4,887,000	19,064,972
Alaska.....	3,621,137	—	700,000	2,921,137
Hawaii.....	9,062,614	—	1,500,000	7,562,614
Panama Canal Zone.....	700,000	—	—	700,000
Puerto Rico.....	48,738,159	—	1,200,000	47,538,159
Virgin Islands.....	1,189,252	—	230,000	959,252
Not allocated to specific States.....	233,778,758	25,630,116	—	208,148,642
Administrative expense in District of Columbia.....	37,332,795	4,117,415	190,450	33,024,930

Source: U. S. Treasury Department, Report Showing the Financial Status of Funds Provided in the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1935 as of Mar. 31, 1936, and Treasury Forms SF-1.

TABLE 23.—Federal Emergency Relief Administration grants May 23, 1933, through Dec. 31, 1935

State or Territory	Grants for general relief purposes ¹	Special grants for—					Total, all grants ^{1,2}
		Transient relief	Rural rehabilitation	Education	Federal Surplus Relief Corporation commodities	Miscellaneous	
Alabama.....	\$34,132,282	\$1,691,320	\$5,854,850	\$1,411,103	\$2,975,300	\$4,381,925	\$50,446,780
Arizona.....	11,683,523	3,279,381	265,000	207,475	1,029,480	1,256,050	17,720,909
Arkansas.....	29,461,516	1,723,108	7,105,000	861,636	1,796,000	5,093,709	46,040,969
California.....	144,179,245	9,015,260	2,910,565	2,910,565	2,808,000	3,652,793	163,793,863
Colorado.....	33,587,507	1,979,331	1,159,314	518,362	2,245,000	980,414	40,469,928
Connecticut.....	22,663,645	1,068,797	65,435	582,975	1,121,000	150,388	25,652,240
Delaware.....	2,042,729	76,395	—	12,885	150,000	122,768	2,404,777
District of Columbia.....	14,327,189	1,682,047	—	233,404	528,000	221,976	16,992,616
Florida.....	33,994,697	2,167,181	3,190,000	706,866	2,445,000	6,298,226	48,801,970
Georgia.....	39,199,927	1,673,867	5,221,875	1,330,554	1,964,000	2,963,305	52,345,528
Idaho.....	12,001,451	729,667	259,000	204,234	812,000	1,428,812	15,432,164
Illinois.....	195,650,724	3,728,500	1,280,000	2,862,744	6,068,000	1,660,503	211,236,471
Indiana.....	45,581,795	1,443,154	480,000	1,250,018	2,198,000	1,343,310	52,296,277
Iowa.....	20,166,732	1,300,282	1,066,040	777,229	1,463,000	1,149,553	25,952,836
Kansas.....	32,648,996	1,952,458	1,443,395	644,671	3,465,000	3,172,347	43,326,867
Kentucky.....	30,198,157	1,086,856	719,000	1,134,167	2,061,000	1,186,776	36,385,956
Louisiana.....	37,883,004	2,981,016	4,579,463	1,056,615	1,487,000	2,027,114	50,014,212
Maine.....	10,845,275	584,925	696,850	323,323	428,000	794,669	13,673,042
Maryland.....	30,875,891	1,996,095	8,225	652,404	1,028,000	1,106,454	35,667,069
Massachusetts.....	115,732,692	964,711	93,930	1,114,430	4,099,000	204,715	122,209,478
Michigan.....	105,788,754	1,049,691	975,500	1,945,727	5,181,000	1,296,327	116,236,999
Minnesota.....	64,382,486	1,992,835	1,151,720	1,086,435	5,035,000	1,297,667	74,946,143
Mississippi.....	23,679,994	692,616	4,368,223	1,198,514	1,482,000	3,354,545	34,775,892
Missouri.....	55,921,436	2,878,454	1,615,650	1,432,040	4,167,000	4,982,720	70,997,300
Montana.....	20,156,471	940,000	336,200	244,765	2,231,000	1,749,598	25,658,034
Nebraska.....	21,431,547	891,988	1,333,142	543,915	2,877,000	2,163,896	29,241,488
Nevada.....	3,466,992	1,001,790	147,000	48,088	395,000	422,534	5,481,404
New Hampshire.....	5,348,445	577,651	187,500	188,765	255,000	114,743	6,672,104
New Jersey.....	85,444,420	1,261,182	548,471	1,369,747	2,867,000	1,744,103	93,234,923
New Mexico.....	12,912,735	1,662,461	1,746,000	218,088	2,567,000	731,944	19,838,228
New York.....	372,951,640	6,042,201	325,569	1,901,612	10,214,000	8,195,752	399,630,774
North Carolina.....	29,435,432	692,777	3,892,000	1,490,321	1,374,000	3,513,654	39,898,184
North Dakota.....	24,012,747	502,459	984,000	235,081	8,121,000	704,887	34,560,174
Ohio.....	156,542,312	4,020,500	2,081,000	2,841,414	5,338,000	2,215,021	173,038,747
Oklahoma.....	36,160,284	967,945	1,700,575	1,015,174	2,964,000	3,332,274	46,140,252
Oregon.....	18,097,026	1,221,444	263,600	396,083	931,000	317,353	21,226,506
Pennsylvania.....	281,284,074	4,059,986	583,000	3,994,414	5,480,000	2,621,261	298,022,735
Rhode Island.....	6,200,788	411,779	—	260,045	517,000	7,425,348	37,065,388
South Carolina.....	26,132,413	876,204	3,645,350	919,108	2,043,000	3,449,313	37,065,388
South Dakota.....	32,315,135	448,900	1,101,000	229,711	8,672,000	817,452	43,584,198
Tennessee.....	27,504,732	2,784,910	1,608,963	1,257,396	1,846,000	2,790,878	37,792,879
Texas.....	60,984,581	3,361,727	10,456,396	2,740,877	9,658,000	11,258,182	98,459,763
Utah.....	17,225,387	582,625	443,006	298,350	779,000	1,379,482	20,707,850
Vermont.....	3,136,462	15,000	367,000	155,816	209,000	52,004	3,935,372
Virginia.....	18,244,526	2,827,345	1,785,000	1,269,455	1,481,000	1,334,195	26,301,521
Washington.....	33,260,524	1,667,878	908,500	696,325	1,223,000	987,051	38,708,278

¹ Adjusted to reflect the redeposit by North Dakota of \$2,137,085 unexpended balance at the dissolution of Federal administrative control, and redeposits by Georgia of \$350,000 and by Louisiana of \$50,000, all of which were made during December 1935.

² Does not include \$88,960,000 of Federal Emergency Relief Administration funds transferred to Civil Works Administration.

TABLE 23.—Federal Emergency Relief Administration grants, May 23, 1933, through Dec. 31, 1935—Continued

State or Territory	Grants for general relief purposes	Special grants for—					Total, all grants
		Transient relief	Rural rehabilitation	Education	Federal Surplus Relief Corporation commodities	Miscellaneous	
West Virginia.....	\$40,090,688	\$611,036	\$1,406,988	\$699,728	\$1,727,000	\$1,335,721	\$45,871,161
Wisconsin.....	69,464,402	1,561,365	516,000	1,288,554	3,522,000	684,398	77,036,719
Wyoming.....	5,327,850	691,777	760,000	90,511	2,054,000	689,234	9,613,372
Total.....	2,553,747,260	87,420,877	79,438,230	48,851,719	134,770,780	102,736,822	3,006,965,688
Alaska.....	1,078,060		460,000	3,285	15,000	800,000	2,356,345
Hawaii.....	5,897,561		35,000	5,000			5,937,561
Puerto Rico.....	26,419,661		809,928	116,750	1,635,000	1,000	28,982,339
Virgin Islands.....	889,669			9,500	292,500	25,200	1,216,869
Grand total.....	2,588,032,211	87,420,877	80,743,158	48,986,254	136,713,280	103,563,022	3,045,458,502

Mr. THURSTON. Mr. Chairman, briefly I want to direct the attention of the membership to these figures. There is a very wide discrepancy in the amount that has been contributed, from the different States, in order to meet this great emergency. My own State of Iowa the first year practically matched the Federal funds by contributing 50 percent of the amount used for general relief purposes. Last year probably 41 percent, but this table shows that there are a number of States which have only contributed 2, 3, 4, or 5 percent, and possibly there are one or two States that did not contribute 1 percent. So the Federal Government was either required or obliged to make up the deficit. I contend that this was not a fair allocation. Surely, there is no State in this Union that was not in a financial position to have contributed some substantial portion of the relief needed for the support of its citizens requiring relief or assistance. It seems to me we should have a provision requiring each State to make some specific contribution to relief funds and if that amount should be fixed at 20, or possibly 25 percent, then the State would be more interested in the administration of relief funds.

We or the States or their subdivisions would have a personal interest in the allocation or the distribution of the funds and it would be more equitable to the entire country if such a rule were adopted. I interrogated Mr. Hopkins in regard to this subject when he was before our committee 2 years ago and he said he would insist that there should be a matching of funds, a 50-50 contribution. When he came in the next year, however, and the disparity in these figures was called to his attention, he said he was overruled—and he could only be overruled by the President—that he was unable to follow the rule or the agreement he had made. Being further interrogated he said it was largely a question of the ability of the governors of these different States to get all they could. So we here have concrete evidence of the bargaining power of some of the Governors in these States, and certain Governors did get very excellent bargains for their States as compared with amounts received by other States. If all States should be required to furnish, say one-fifth or one-quarter of the funds, and have direct immediate contact in the distribution of these funds with local persons in charge of the distribution who would be better acquainted with the needs of the community, doubtless, a more equitable and even a less expensive administration could be established. In the main, in my section of the country all of the administrators are imported from other sections of the country. I hear this complaint made generally. We are in favor of home rule, and it seems to me it would be preferable and, in fact, imperative, to require it in this respect.

As to whether political influences have had anything to do with the relief situation, I have before me a page from a local Washington newspaper under date of April 26, 1936, giving rather concise and interesting tables upon this subject. I take it it is wholly nonpartisan, unbiased, and was obtained through a broad Nation-wide contact or poll with different classes of people throughout the United States. These figures were collected by the American Institute of Public Opinion. Concisely, it says:

A fair majority of the Democrats believe there is political influence in relief administration and a huge majority of the Republicans are convinced of it.

The question asked was:

In your opinion, does politics play a part in the handling of relief in your community?

The poll disclosed that 65 percent of those interrogated say "yes", 18 percent replied "no", and 17 percent have no opinion upon the subject. So, of those voting, almost 4 to 1 say there has been and there is political interference in the administration of relief.

As divided according to the political affiliation on this page, the Democrats are listed next and 55 percent say "yes", 25 percent say "no", and 20 percent express no opinion. So, more than 2 to 1 of the Democratic faith say there is political interference. Of the Republicans, 80 percent say "yes", 8 percent say "no", 12 percent express no opinion. So 10 to 1 of the Republicans feel that this harmful influence is at play.

As to the Socialists, and they surely cannot be regarded as partisan in this sense, 77 percent say "yes", 9 percent say "no", or 8 to 1 say political influence has been used.

It is interesting to note the percentage in some of the great States. Sixty-seven percent of the people in the State of Pennsylvania believe there is political influence; in Illinois, 60 percent; in Massachusetts, 72 percent; and in the States where opposition is expressed, only one-quarter, one-fifth, or probably one-sixth express opinion in opposition.

Mr. SHANNON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THURSTON. I yield.

Mr. SHANNON. From what paper is the gentleman quoting?

Mr. THURSTON. This is from a table taken from the Washington Post, but the figures were compiled by the American Institute of Public Opinion, a nonpartisan organization.

This poll furnishes nonpartisan evidence that political influence is at play in all sections of the country. So if we could turn this relief from Federal administration of a highly political character to State agencies free from political control, undoubtedly we would meet the desire of a great majority of our people; we would have administration free from politics and under the control of those who are most capable of exercising this function. The decisive result of this poll should be carefully considered by the Congress.

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman care to yield right there?

Mr. THURSTON. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, I am very much interested in the gentleman's very fair discussion of this interesting phase of relief, but I would like to suggest to the gentleman, and to know his reaction to the suggestion, as to why he thinks if relief were administered by State agencies there would not be the same so-called political influence? And may I draw his attention to this: I do not know what his experience has been, but my experience

has been that there has been politics in this business. It has, however, usually been confined to localities and to local people in charge of relief. There have been localities, and there are localities today, where the influences are Republican, and the Republican influences are handling relief.

Mr. BUCHANAN. That is, just a few.

Mr. WOODRUM. Oh, no; and they are handling it—I do not say with the approval of the leaders of the Republican Party, but this is just as natural as it is for people to be natural, human beings. Now, this is happening in my own district, I may say to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. THURSTON. Should we not relieve those gentlemen from the temptation?

Mr. WOODRUM. You cannot relieve them as long as they are human beings. They are gentlemen in strategic positions in this relief program in the State of Virginia—in Democratic counties, Republicans handling relief. Wherever they can they are doing it beneficially to their own party. The point is I want to suggest—

Mr. THURSTON. I hope the gentleman will be brief, for my time is being shortened.

Mr. WOODRUM. I will give the gentleman some of my time if he does not object to this interruption.

Mr. Chairman, the point I make is that, after all, is not our particular interest at this time in whether or not the Relief Administration in Washington or the national administration is making any effort at all to divert this relief proposition to its own political advantage? I venture the assertion that no party or power could administer relief such as this without politics creeping into it at certain points, very often against even its own wishes.

Mr. THURSTON. In reply to the gentleman, may I say that in the State of Iowa practically all of our boards having to do with charity and public assistance of every character are nonpartisan, and both the major political parties are represented in the constituency of the board or the commission. We therefore rarely have any complaint that partisan influence has in any degree affected the action of those bodies.

Mr. MAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THURSTON. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. The gentleman read certain statistics from a survey which has been made. I would like to know if the State of Kentucky is reported in those statistics, and, if so, what is the percentage of approval or disapproval.

Mr. THURSTON. Mr. Chairman, to expedite this and other inquiries that may be made, I ask unanimous consent to include in my extension of remarks the complete table, which will show the percent in all the States.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The table referred to follows:

AMERICA SPEAKS

In your opinion does politics play a part in the handling of relief in your locality? Yes, 65 percent; no, 18 percent; no opinion, 17 percent. Should relief be returned to State and local governments? Yes, 55 percent; no, 45 percent.

RESULTS OF NATIONAL POLL ANALYZED

Question 1: In your opinion does politics play a part in the handling of relief in your locality? Yes, —; no, —; no opinion, —.

The national vote

[Yes, 65 percent; no, 18 percent; no opinion, 17 percent]

THE VOTE BY STATES

State	Yes (percent)	No (percent)	No opinion (percent)
Arkansas.....	83	14	3
New Jersey.....	78	12	10
West Virginia.....	77	13	10
Louisiana.....	76	9	15
Rhode Island.....	76	14	10
Connecticut.....	75	14	11

The national vote—Continued THE VOTE BY STATES—continued

State	Yes (percent)	No (percent)	No opinion (percent)
Mississippi.....	75	14	11
Washington.....	73	12	15
Massachusetts.....	72	14	14
Oklahoma.....	71	19	10
New Mexico.....	71	18	11
Kansas.....	70	20	10
Minnesota.....	69	17	14
Arizona.....	69	19	12
Maine.....	68	17	15
New York.....	68	16	16
South Dakota.....	68	20	12
Texas.....	68	17	15
Wyoming.....	67	27	6
Idaho.....	67	21	12
Florida.....	67	15	18
Alabama.....	67	13	20
Ohio.....	67	15	18
Pennsylvania.....	67	18	15
California.....	65	13	22
Tennessee.....	65	22	13
Virginia.....	65	17	18
Nebraska.....	65	20	15
Nevada.....	63	24	13
South Carolina.....	63	23	14
Missouri.....	63	23	14
Indiana.....	63	21	16
Michigan.....	63	10	27
New Hampshire.....	63	9	28
North Dakota.....	62	30	8
Iowa.....	62	22	16
Delaware.....	61	23	16
Wisconsin.....	61	21	18
Illinois.....	60	18	22
Georgia.....	60	21	19
Colorado.....	59	28	13
Maryland.....	58	18	24
Utah.....	56	27	17
Oregon.....	56	23	21
North Carolina.....	55	18	27
Montana.....	52	17	31
Vermont.....	51	38	11
Kentucky.....	43	27	30

PARTIES

Democrats.....	55	25	20
Republicans.....	80	8	12
Socialists.....	77	9	14

GROUPS

Reliefers.....	49	25	26
Farmers.....	70	19	11
Women.....	58	17	25
Young Peoples.....	60	14	26

Question 2: Should the responsibility of caring for all persons on relief be returned now to State and local governments? Yes —; no —.

The national vote

[Yes, 55 percent; no, 45 percent]

THE VOTE BY STATES

State	Yes (percent)	No (percent)
Delaware.....	75	25
Massachusetts.....	67	33
Rhode Island.....	65	35
Connecticut.....	63	37
New Jersey.....	63	37
Michigan.....	63	37
Iowa.....	63	37
Missouri.....	62	38
New York.....	61	39
Maryland.....	61	39
Illinois.....	61	39
Virginia.....	59	41
Indiana.....	58	42
New Hampshire.....	57	43
Nebraska.....	56	44
South Carolina.....	56	44
Mississippi.....	56	44
Ohio.....	55	45
Kentucky.....	55	45
Texas.....	55	45
Maine.....	54	46
Kansas.....	54	46
Arizona.....	53	47
New Mexico.....	53	47
West Virginia.....	52	48
Minnesota.....	51	49

The national vote—Continued
THE VOTE BY STATES—continued

State	Yes (per- cent)	No (per- cent)
North Dakota.....	51	49
Oklahoma.....	51	49
Wisconsin.....	50	50
Nevada.....	50	50
Washington.....	50	50
Pennsylvania.....	52	48
Tennessee.....	49	51
Florida.....	48	52
Montana.....	48	52
Idaho.....	48	52
Wyoming.....	48	52
Louisiana.....	47	53
California.....	47	53
North Carolina.....	46	54
Colorado.....	46	54
Oregon.....	46	54
South Dakota.....	45	55
Utah.....	45	55
Arkansas.....	43	57
Georgia.....	41	59
Vermont.....	40	60
Alabama.....	38	62
PARTIES		
Democrats.....	44	56
Republicans.....	72	28
Socialists.....	38	62
GROUPS		
Reliefers.....	41	59
Farmers.....	60	40
Women.....	56	44
Young people.....	47	53

Mr. MAY. The table shows the entire country?

Mr. THURSTON. Yes; each of the 48 States.

Mr. Chairman, we must recognize that this relief problem is not a current one. It must be apparent to all Members that it will be a problem of long duration. If this premise is correct—and I believe it is—we must prepare to handle this matter not only in a logical and economical manner but in a humane manner as well. We are all equally interested in the welfare of women and children who are unfortunate and who do not have a sufficient income, as well as the men who may be aged or impaired; but it must be apparent to all of us that after 3 years of Federal relief administration and the expenditure of approximately \$16,000,000,000, we still have practically as many people on relief and unemployed as we had 3 years ago. Under these circumstances we have not solved this problem, and if we have not obtained real, satisfactory results under the present procedure, surely we are broad enough and we should be tolerant enough to explore the field and ascertain if we cannot make some changes or agree to some amendments so that the future administration of this program may be sound and fair to all concerned.

Mr. RICH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THURSTON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. For the last year Members of Congress have criticized the way the relief proposition has been handled. This bill proposes to handle the relief matter exactly the same as it was handled last year. Why are the Members of Congress permitting this bill to go through in the same form as last year after all of this criticism?

Mr. THURSTON. The final vote, of course, will answer the gentleman's question.

Mr. MAIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THURSTON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MAIN. Is it not significant and rather disheartening to have Mr. Hopkins, after these years of experience and the large amount of money at his disposal, admit that he has no answer or solution for the unemployment problem?

Mr. THURSTON. Yes. However, I think the problem and the solution of relief and unemployment is one for the Congress and not for an administrative or executive officer of the Government.

Mr. Chairman, to summarize my contention, the membership will have an opportunity to vote upon making these important changes, which would require a reasonable contribution upon the part of the States, and the power of directly supervising relief will be delegated to nonpartisan local officials. Not having made any appreciable gain, or having corrected to any great degree the relief or unemployment problems, surely we should be open-minded in our approach to any other proposed changes or suggestions that might assist in solving these problems. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. BUCK] such time as he may desire.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, I realize that the most important matter contained in this bill is the question of the appropriations for relief, but there are other matters contained therein of great interest, and it is one of these to which I desire to call the attention of the Committee this morning.

Mr. Chairman, the first deficiency appropriation bill includes an item for the establishment of an Air Corps depot in the vicinity of Sacramento, Calif. This is a most vital air-defense appropriation, urged by the War Department as part of its general air-defense program and one immediately necessary. I am happy to have had a hand in the work which has led to the adoption of this program. Approval of this item will bring to a successful conclusion the campaign which I have waged since my first election to Congress in 1932 for the establishment of Sacramento as a major Army air base.

During 1918, the final year of the World War, the War Department established an aviation field about 14 miles west of the city of Sacramento, the site of which was donated by local citizens and which was christened Mather Field. This was used as a training school until 1919. Later it was used as a base for an aerial forest control. In 1922 it was placed on an inactive status, but in 1930 it was again opened as a training school and kept in service until November 1, 1932, when the units then stationed there were removed to permanent Air Corps fields. The close proximity of this station to Sacramento made its citizens air-minded long before the rest of the country awakened to its present state of air consciousness.

It has been the earnest desire of those of us who are fully informed of the facts, and who know the strategic advantages to the Nation and to the Army in the location of an air base somewhere near Sacramento, to see action taken to locate there permanently a major branch of the Army's air activities. This I have been urging continuously since the very first months of my first term in Congress. Facts, fortunately, have been with me. As General Embick said, in testifying before the Appropriations Committee in the hearings on the pending bill:

From a strategic standpoint Sacramento is a good location. It is a central location, and we think it is withdrawn enough from the coast so it is reasonably secure. It is an economical location because it is at the main railway junction in that area.

The climate is mild; the average percentage of sunshine is high; the prevailing winds and average wind velocity are excellent, and even during the so-called rainy season there is a great preponderance of bright weather. These natural advantages I have presented from time to time to the War Department, to the Committee on Military Affairs, and to the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee handling the War Department bills, in efforts to secure their cooperation in providing funds such as are carried in this bill. As their investigation has proceeded, these gentlemen have come to the conclusion that Sacramento is the ideal location for an Army air repair depot that would serve all peacetime needs of the west coast. I am indeed happy to find that the Appropriations Committee, as a whole, has seen fit to include in this bill the recommendation of the War Department for an expenditure of \$7,000,000 to establish this permanent air depot.

It will be established on land to be newly acquired, on which options have been secured through the cooperation of

local authorities. The new site will comprise 1,117.21 acres of land lying to the northeast of Sacramento on the main line of the Central Pacific Railroad. On this will be built necessary barracks, noncommissioned officers' and officers' quarters, administration building, post exchange, hospital, gymnasium and auditorium, heating plant, as well as other necessary accessories. The depot supply building will provide a structure of approximately 961 feet in length by 430 feet in breadth, containing approximately 12,600,000 cubic feet of space, together with the necessary utilities and appurtenances, such as water and sewer mains, electricity and power, paving, and so forth. This one building will cost \$1,167,086.

Other parts of the work proposed include engineering shops, to cost \$1,406,193; a repair dock, consisting of a building 602 feet in length by 152 feet in breadth, containing approximately 6,000,000 cubic feet; operations building and hangar; paint, oil and dope storage buildings. Radio towers, night lighting system, runways, and necessary equipment are similarly provided. The entire break-down of the proposed Pacific air depot may be found on pages 621-623 of the hearings before the Appropriations Committee, where it was inserted by General Guiney, of the Quartermaster General's Office.

It is anticipated that it will take approximately a year and one-half to complete construction of the air depot. When completed, as General Westover said in his testimony, the Sacramento depot will serve all peacetime repair and overhaul purposes of the west coast, including the overseas units at Hawaii. It will also serve to meet an essential and initial wartime need.

By an Executive order on September 26, 1935, President Roosevelt approved the recommendation of the Secretaries of War and Navy that Rockwell Field, San Diego, should be evacuated by the Army, and Moffet Field by the Navy. Moffet Field is, however, entirely unsuitable, according to the Army officials, for an air depot, and subsequent developments have made it inadvisable to give further consideration of the utilization of Benton Field at Alameda for this purpose. This order and the subsequent developments have, of course, hastened the necessity of developing a new field for the protection of the west coast. Confidential investigations and surveys by the War Department have been in progress for the last 5 months and have resulted in definitely fixing on the Sacramento site which has been recommended unhesitatingly to the Appropriations Committee.

The question will now arise in the minds of many as to why Mather Field, which the Government already owns, is not to be utilized as the site of this new air repair and supply depot. This I think I should explain a little, so there may be no thought in your minds that we are needlessly expending money when the Government already owns land in the vicinity of Sacramento.

In the first place, the acreage of Mather Field is not sufficient for the proposed plant. Additional land would have to be acquired in any event. Secondly, the new site is to be located on a land-grant railroad, which will give the Government an immense saving in transportation costs to and from the new field. But the primary reason is that Mather Field has been selected as the proper location for a bombardment group for the defense of central and northern California. This means that eventually Sacramento will be the heart of Army Air Corps activities, both offensive and defensive.

The selection of Mather Field as the location for this bombardment group is one of the reasons why, from the standpoint of economy, an air depot in the same vicinity is not only advantageous but probably necessary. Permit me to quote General Westover again, in his testimony before the committee, when he stated that the Department "would consider it both an unwise as well as an inefficient way of doing it to put a depot on the same field with a bombardment or other heavy aerial unit. The two would not have sufficient room for their respective operations with the increase of the size of bombing aircraft." There would be con-

flit between training and field operations of the tactical units and the flight testing of aircraft overhauled by the depot. Hence there would result a loss of time and efficiency by both the units and depot if they were located together.

This, I think, fully explains the reason why Mather Field is not to be utilized in the establishment of the new air repair and supply base. It will, however, be utilized later by combat units of the air force to be organized in accordance with the Drum Board development.

As one who has fought earnestly and sincerely for the development of the Air Force by both the Army and Navy, and, in fact, for the development of every branch of the national defense, I am delighted to see this first step taken in carrying out the air-defense program authorized by Congress at its last session. Naturally I am grateful that the first unit is to be established in my own district. To that extent I hope I may be permitted to congratulate the citizens of Sacramento and vicinity and to thank the public-spirited citizens, newspapers, and civic bodies who have continuously aided my efforts here to bring about recognition by the War Department and Congress of Sacramento's availability as a strategic location for this base.

May I add, in closing, that I hope to see this unit added to in the next regular War Department appropriation bill by the establishment of other units which are necessary wherever they may be located. Nothing is more important under modern conditions to the protection of our Nation and preservation of our liberties than the proper location of adequately equipped air bases. The ground work there performed, the repair and overhaul, the testing and retesting of our planes, are the essentials of successful operations in the air. Bases such as this one about to be established are essential to any intelligent defense policy. [Applause.]

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CURLEY].

Mr. CURLEY. Mr. Chairman, I would have to disregard all the statistics of all the agencies of this country on the unemployment problem to agree with my distinguished friend from Kentucky [Mr. MAY]. When I point out to the gentleman from Kentucky that 20 percent of the 7,000,000 people of the city of New York are handcuffed to misery and suffering and are unemployed, perhaps the gentleman might change his opinion.

Mr. Chairman, I had no intention of engaging in debate on this proposition at all, but at the suggestion of the chairman of the committee, I thought it might be well at this point to state my views on this humane legislation. I have listened intently to the discussions both for and against this deficiency bill. I was quite amused at the statements made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD], as well as my distinguished colleague from New York [Mr. TABER]. The gentleman from Massachusetts pointed out the fact that in New York City relief money is being spent for boondoggling, eurythmic dancing, cartography, and other useless projects, and for all sorts of nonsensical things which had nothing to do with the relief of the unemployed.

Since the open debate on the deficiency bill before the House for consideration began, several Members on the minority side engaged, unwittingly perhaps, in some rather unwarranted and unbridled criticism of certain features in administration of relief in certain localities, among which was the city of New York. Ridicule and selected satire seemed to be the weapons employed.

With 12 millions unemployed and 40,000,000 members of their families handcuffed to poverty and misery, it is a dangerous proposition to inject glaring inaccuracies in the discussion of this vitally human legislation.

During the discussion yesterday on this question of relief money, reference was made to the conduct of the administration of relief in the city of New York at a time when there were approximately 1,400,000 persons receiving relief.

It is because of this reference that I deemed it proper to enter into this debate in order that certain misstatements may be corrected.

I have heard the word "boondoggling" and "eurythmic" dancing mentioned frequently at different times in this House in various debates and particularly in the one now in force. The reference was plainly made with the object of bringing down ridicule on the administration of relief and especially in New York State. To clarify the situation, as one in a position to know, permit me to state that on September 14, 1934, a special investigating committee of the legislative branch of the government of the city of New York instituted an investigation of the affairs of the department of public welfare and other bureaus and departments of the city of New York concerned with the administration of relief.

A series of public hearings was held. In fact, 18 public hearings were held from March 22, 1935, to May 9, 1935, and 110 witnesses testified.

During the course of the public hearings, William Hodson, Commissioner of the Department of Welfare and Chairman of the Emergency Relief Bureau, resigned as a result of the disclosures brought out at the said hearings.

This complete report is predicated upon sworn testimony and exhibits and are set forth in a complete, accurate analysis in a complete printed report at its conclusion on July 8, 1935.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from New York 2 additional minutes.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURLEY. I asked the gentleman from Pennsylvania yesterday to yield to me and the gentleman refused.

Mr. RICH. I wanted to ask whether the gentleman had read Mr. Johnson's report?

Mr. CURLEY. The set-up of the Relief Administration in the city of New York was authorized pursuant to a number of statutes, rules, and regulations.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] stated yesterday in his criticism of relief administration that he would make an effort to have the said Administration revert back to municipalities. For the information of the gentleman from New York, the administration of relief in his State of New York was and is authorized under chapter 798 of the laws passed at the extraordinary session of the New York Legislature in 1931. This law is known as the Wickes Act and became effective as of September 23, 1931.

And who is Mr. Wickes? He is a member of the same party as the gentleman from New York, the Republican Party. There was no authority in the city of New York to provide direct relief to needy in their homes. Pursuant to this law an emergency work bureau to administer work relief was set up on November 6, 1931, and early in December of 1931 the home-relief bureau was organized. The Federal Government played no part in this program until May 1933.

At this point there were 1,400,000 members of families on the relief rolls of New York City. At the present time there are 201,000 heads of families, approximately, on relief. In the spring of 1934 a new set-up came into existence to control and direct relief work. That was the E. R. B.—emergency-relief bureau—all the members of which were appointed by the mayor. The New York City commissioner of public welfare, an ex-officio member of the bureau, was designated to act as chairman of that bureau and in such capacity was director of the entire relief program of the city of New York. He resigned his appointment as chairman, but he continued on as a member of the E. R. B.

For the information of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] the Wickes Act was and is the source of authority for the E. R. B. and describes the rules for the administration of relief in the city of New York. It also sets up a State body known as the T. E. R. A.—temporary emergency relief bureau.

The life of the T. E. R. A. has been extended from year to year at successive sessions of the legislature. By chapter 25 of the Laws of 1935 the emergency period was extended to February 16, 1936.

To stress the point raised by my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New York, that he intended that relief should revert back to the municipalities the aforesaid Wickes Act describes the present depression and bases the enactment on the declaration of emergency. It is stated that the granting of relief is primarily an obligation of municipalities, but it is necessary to supplement such municipal relief by the assistance provided for in the act. However, all payments made by the State are made expressly subject to the rule of the T. E. R. A. A violation of these rules was made a misdemeanor.

The responsibility is placed upon the city for a proper administration of the relief because the law declares that relief is primarily a function of the municipality.

Under the authority of the Wickes Act, grants are made to municipalities, which was 75 percent of the total expenditures, 50 percent of this by the Federal Government, the other 25 percent by the city.

By the State law, the Governor is authorized, as agent of the State, to receive Federal grants. It might be well to note that in addition to the 25 percent paid by the city 16 percent of every dollar of Federal taxes collected comes from New York City and approximately 65 percent of every dollar of State taxes comes from the same sources.

At the first public hearing Commissioner Hodson, at that time chairman of the E. R. B., was interrogated under oath. He said in answer to the question:

So that by reason of improper investigation, or at least insufficient investigation, the taxpayers of the city of New York are losing approximately \$24,000,000 a year through plain, ordinary grafting and chiseling on the part of people who are on these rolls—this is so, isn't it?

Replied:

I should say substantially so.

This was verified to a still greater degree through a subordinate, Mr. Arthur P. McNulty, administrative assistant to the director of the home-relief administration. He estimated that 15 percent of the people receiving relief were not entitled to it under the law. He concluded, therefore, that approximately \$3,000,000 were taken a month by chisellers.

In the face of these facts it seems to be that the shoe is on the other foot. The Democratic administration is not to be blamed for the appalling conditions as shown by the sworn statements of Republican administration of relief in the city of New York.

Much has been said about "boondoggling." Under title "Service Projects", on page 161 of the report, we find the inventor of the word "boondoggling" testifying. He is Mr. Robert Marshall, of Springfield, Mass. He is the gentleman who gave this investigation, and the world, "boondoggling", a subject taught in his branch of the recreational schools. There are 150 relief workers engaged in boondoggling in his school in various craft activities. [Applause.]

SOCIAL JUSTICE

President Roosevelt's program of social justice for all instead of any special or privileged group in this Nation can only be realized by the application of plain, homely, common sense and rational reasoning. Any other course would be the essence of invincible ignorance in a crisis such as we are passing through. It was my proud privilege to have been elected on a platform pledged to the New Deal last November. After serving in the House of Representatives for the past 5 months, I am firmly convinced that no other nation at its very best was ever as good as the United States of America at its worst. With 153 years of tremendous growth to its credit, the Nation in 1929 was sliding down a financial hole with no sign of a bottom in sight. So that by March 4, 1933, all that was left of the gears of the Hoover Republican machine were stripped completely and threw our American economic structure out of balance. The first step under the New Deal was to replace the wornout gears with new ones in this human mechanism, which now are meshing properly and grinding slowly but surely toward recovery of normal economic balance.

For the past 5 months all I heard from the Republican minority is the stereotyped squawk, "Where are you going to get the money?" and "When are you going to balance the Budget?" Well, my answer to that is where economy is established at the expense or sacrifice of essential expenditure to eliminate misery, suffering, and starvation among 33½ percent of our population, then I say it is parsimony and not economy. When our Republican critics pretend to worry about the billions of dollars spent, and to be spent, to relieve human suffering, why did not they think of that back in the days of Harding, Coolidge, and Hoover? Did they leave a balanced Budget to the New Deal in 1933? They did not. Did they provide or set up any concrete plan to give relief to the 15,000,000 unemployed in the Hoover administration? No; they did not. Did they try to promote better trading relations with friendly foreign nations, so that a market could be maintained for our surplus commodities? No; they did not; but they did the best they could to close those foreign markets by the enactment of the Hawley-Smoot Tariff Act.

The New Deal is refreshing in that it spelled the departure from the past reactionary and orthodox mechanics of our American system of economics, in keeping pace with the times, and in quest of real social justice for all our citizens. The sneers of an enemy are sometimes worth more than the flattery of a friend. All the golden promises of future prosperity offered by the board of strategy of the Republican Party could never sweeten the bitterness of the cup of fear the millions of poverty-stricken citizens were compelled to drain under the Hoover debacle of 1929. Like the ostrich that buries his head in the sand, they deceive themselves with belief the public has forgotten the 12 years of Republican misrule. To hear their constant warnings to the majority side about "extravagant spending" one would think this child of depression was ours. When, as a matter of record, they petted and pampered it for over 12 years when it was healthy, and then when it became afflicted with nervous break-down they abandoned it on the doorstep of President Roosevelt. Now, a fact is just like a birthmark; you may try to cover it up, but you cannot rub it out.

A LEGACY OF CHAOS

As a matter of public record, the previous Republican administration bequeathed the Democratic administration under President Roosevelt in 1933 an unbalanced Budget amounting to \$3,068,000,000. Then, in answer to the constant partisan clamor about "broken platform pledges" by the Democratic administration, let me state that from the day in June 1932 when the Democratic platform was adopted in Chicago up to March 4, 1933, the whole economic structure was in a badly shattered condition under the then existing Republican regime. So that when Franklin D. Roosevelt took his oath of office as President of the United States on that date he faced the greatest economic collapse in our history as a problem to solve. What a solemn and grave situation left him to face by these present-day critics. Banking institutions closing in every city and town in every State in the Union. Business paralyzed all over the country. Bankruptcies galore were common headlines in the daily papers. Fifty million people facing starvation, poverty, and stark misery. Railroads throughout the Nation crippled financially.

That was the picture of our great Nation when Hoover, the great engineer, handed the reins over to our real, peerless leader, Franklin D. Roosevelt, in 1933. In such an emergency what did he do? He appealed to Divine Providence to guide him to solve the human problems. He rose far above any party platform pledges. Ten months had passed since they were approved and when the crisis arrived. Extraordinary and heroic measures and action were necessary, imperative, and mandatory in the premises. All previous policy to save the Nation from complete collapse had failed under the Hoover Republican regime. And, just like the master surgeon resorting to the last extreme, President Roosevelt performed a major operation on a very sick body politic to save her life by issuing his famous proclamation declaring a bank holiday, closing all financial institutions throughout the country, thereby saving what was left of deposits. Yet in the face of

that masterpiece in leadership these partisan critics inject the fiction about "broken party platform pledges" not only in the spoken but in the written word. In the words of Don Louis Gougoud:

O Hand! How much white vellum thou hast written; thou wilt make famous the vellum, but thou, thyself wilt remain the bare top of a fagot of bones.

The Roosevelt theory of a real democratic form of government of, by, and for the people, applied in a common-sense, practical manner, actually means the distribution of the wealth of the Nation in work and wages for the mass through healthy cooperation and coordination of industry and its related business with labor. It is the only practical solution of the appalling social crime of unemployment. As a matter of fact, it is a fundamental principle of our American system of government and the very essence of any remedy to give relief in this crisis. The mechanics of our economic structure must be revamped to give a proper balance to all the human elements that enter into the life of our great Nation. The substitution of common sense for all the unbridled criticism wandering around in a vacuum would help materially to steer our national ship of state out of troubled into calm waters. It seems, however, that not only must our great President submit himself as a target of unjust criticism, but a mud-slinging spree as well, in a pitiful exhibition to pillory him because of his pledge to keep the faith with the "forgotten man."

No, partisan critic, it was your own great engineer, Herbert Hoover, and his Republican administration from 1928 to 1933 that broke the faith with the American people to "abolish poverty forever and his philanthropic gifts of two chickens in every pot and two cars to every garage."

COMMON SENSE VERSUS RIDICULE

Mr. Chairman, on March 4, 1933, the dawn of a new day in a new era appeared in our American history. The forces of light and reason assumed control of the Government of these United States of America, under the peerless leadership of Hon. Franklin Delano Roosevelt. Simplicity, directness, and sanity were the ingredients of the serum employed in his preparation to vaccinate the then existing impoverished blood of the American people against panic.

Andre Maurois said:

Panic is the result of blind imitation of others. It comes when the critical sense fails, and it is vanquished when logic, displacing imitation, returns to govern the human conduct or action of men.

The radiating, refreshing, and stimulating vitality of President Roosevelt's magnetic leadership immediately aroused the dormant energy of the dazed, weakened, human forces throughout the country and mobilized our vast natural sources of wealth into a galvanic battery of vibrant human activities which electrified the Nation from end to end. His prompt and progressive action in seizing direct control and command of our senile and tottering financial institutions immediately was a masterpiece in leadership as well as statesmanship that has no equal in history.

It was an outstanding constructive public achievement in the form of public service that stands without a parallel in Government administration. It was a fearless display of courage which spelled the doom of the black Pharaohs leading the forces of misery and distress in this country. Yet they heap ridicule and satire on him today.

Warburton said:

Reason is the test of ridicule, not ridicule the test of the truth.

The Democratic administration of our National Government under President Roosevelt's humane policies has turned America's face definitely toward recovery. The shadows of misery and distress are behind us forever. We have met our enemies of reason and common sense in fair combat, with logic as our ammunition—and they are ours. The budding cycle of returning prosperity has arrived under President Roosevelt's practical, homely, common-sense administration.

Permit me to state, Mr. Chairman, that the reactionary critics of our New Deal in government, who thrived on special privilege in the past Republican administration, who

bartered and traded the economic birthrights of the 48 States in the Union, the right to regulate and control unfair monopoly, are now spreading poisonous propaganda against the New Deal in a most vicious, invidious campaign to regain control of our Government. They do not understand that our Government under the New Deal is the servant and not the master of the people; that the New Deal recognizes the fundamental principle that sovereignty still resides with the people, not with special-privileged groups.

WILL OF THE PEOPLE

When that principle is flagrantly violated by any powerful element in the economic life of the Nation, through striking crushing blows at other vital sections of that human structure, then the instrument of the will of the people, the Government, is vested with the police power to intervene temporarily to regulate and control a vicious and dangerous condition which threatens and affects the "peace and happiness", the "general welfare", and "the blessings of liberty" guaranteed the people under the Constitution.

Under such circumstances, temporary governmental regulation and control, as well as protection, of the flow of the blood stream of our national economic life is absolutely essential to our well-being, not primarily in the interest of the State but fundamentally in the interest of the people who comprise the State.

As that great champion of human liberty, Abraham Lincoln, once said, "When an occasion is piled high with difficulties, we must rise to the occasion."

Well, that is exactly what our great President, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, did in this crisis when he initiated his humane, common-sense program to bring our smitten Nation back where she belongs on her feet again. He has led the way to sunshine and happiness out of the chaos he found the Nation in. Why should we not encourage instead of ridiculing him to still greater effort for the less fortunate among us? Let us give him all the support a thankful and grateful Nation has always given to her tried and true public officials. For President Roosevelt has proven our claim he is a peerless leader. The record is the proof.

Mr. BACON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MAPES].

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Chairman, I expect to vote for this bill, although I hope to see it amended to provide for the allocation of the relief appropriation to the States according to their need, the same to be administered by the States and local communities on a nonpartisan basis, thereby taking the Federal Government out of the business of administration of relief funds.

The principal items in the bill, outside of the regular deficiency appropriations, are the appropriations for social security and relief. I supported the social security legislation, knowing that it would require an appropriation to put it into effect, and I am in favor of making the necessary appropriation for that purpose. Without it the social-security law is of no force or effect and might just as well not have been passed.

I shall vote also for the provision in the bill appropriating \$1,425,000,000 for relief. That it is the obligation of the Federal Government to provide funds to care for those who are unemployed and in need so long as they remain in that condition and the States and local communities are unable to provide for them is a question not open for debate as far as I am concerned. The fact that inefficiency, waste, boondoggling, and politics are prevalent in the administration of relief funds is well known, but criticism of the administration of the funds will not feed the hungry, and they must be provided for. The States and local communities should contribute as much as they can toward the support of their unemployed, and everyone hopes that they will be able to carry the full burden without any help from the Federal Government within the not far distant future, but until that time comes the Federal Government must help.

No matter what the percentage of local contribution may be, I believe that it has been demonstrated to the satisfaction of the great majority of the American people that the States

and local communities can administer the funds, whatever is contributed by the Federal Government as well as the amount raised locally, more efficiently and economically and provide for the needs of the people within their respective jurisdictions more adequately and satisfactorily than the Federal Government can do. They should be given that authority, and I shall vote for an amendment to the bill to that effect.

As indicating the sentiment of the country on some of the questions raised by this bill, I have had in mind calling attention to the poll of the American Institute of Public Opinion, which was published in the newspapers a week ago last Sunday, April 26, to which the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. THURSTON] has already referred.

It seems to be the prevailing sentiment of the country, as indicated by this poll, that these relief funds should be turned over to the States and the local communities, and there are some facts brought out or emphasized by that poll to which I should like to call special attention. I assume the poll is a nonpartisan and disinterested one and was made without any reference to partisanship.

The questions submitted to the public were:

First. In your opinion, does politics play a part in the handling of relief in your locality?

Second. Should the responsibility of caring for all persons on relief be returned now to the States and local governments?

The results of the poll show—I quote from the report as printed in the newspapers—that—

Approximately 6 out of every 10 Americans on the average think that politics influences the handling of Federal relief funds in their localities. Nearly one-half the people receiving relief admit it. A fair-sized majority of Democrats believe it. A huge majority of Republicans are convinced of it.

Of the total number of replies received to the first question, 65 percent answered "yes", 18 percent answered "no", and 17 percent expressed no opinion. Divided as to parties, 55 percent of the Democrats said that they believed politics played a part in the handling of relief in their localities, 80 percent of the Republicans so expressed themselves, and 77 percent of the Socialists. Even of those on relief, 49 percent, or nearly one-half, stated that in their opinion there is politics in the handling of Federal donations, 25 percent did not think so, and 26 percent expressed no opinion.

In Michigan, 63 percent of those voting said "yes", 10 percent said "no", and 27 percent expressed no opinion.

As to the second question, "Should the responsibility for caring for all persons on relief be returned now to State and local governments?" 55 percent of those voting said "yes", 45 percent "no." Classified as to party affiliations: Republicans, 72 percent voted "yes", 28 percent "no." Democrats, 44 percent "yes", 56 percent "no."

In Michigan, 63 percent of all the votes, both Republican and Democratic, gave it as their opinion that the responsibility of caring for all persons on relief should be returned now to State and local governments, and 37 percent expressed the opposite opinion.

That the relief program and other administration policies during the last 3 years have gotten nowhere, as far as relieving the unemployment situation is concerned, seems to be conceded. As stated in the report of this poll of the American Institute of Public Opinion:

Nearly everybody knows that approximately 20,000,000 persons were on relief in March 1933; that the Federal Government has spent or loaned \$16,000,000,000 for relief and recovery since then; and that in March 1936 there were still 20,000,000 on relief.

That is not a partisan statement but a plain statement of fact.

The report continues:

The course of action which the voters favor, after watching 3 years of Federal aid to the needy, is to turn the responsibility for relief over to the States and localities.

The vote in Michigan was 63 percent in favor as against 37 percent opposed.

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. McFARLANE].

Mr. McFARLANE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include certain data.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. McFARLANE. Mr. Chairman, I desire to compliment this committee on bringing in this bill \$23,859,268.38 under the Bureau of Budget estimates. Since this deficiency appropriation bill carries appropriations for many of the departments of government as well as funds for relief purposes, I believe it appropriate to refer to the work of these different departments of government and the legislative program worked out under the leadership of our great President, Hon. Franklin D. Roosevelt, and let the record show the results accomplished under this administration. I will also point out as I go along just what this great record of service has meant to the people of Texas and, particularly, of my district.

AGRICULTURE

This is the first national administration we have had in many years that has really tried to do something for agriculture. Recognizing that buying power must be restored before we can remedy unemployment, the agricultural-adjustment program was speedily worked out which has in-

Rental and benefit payments and profits on cotton options made in connection with the commodity program from the beginning of those programs through Feb. 29, 1936, for the Thirteenth Congressional District of Texas, by counties

County	Cotton	Profits on cotton options	Wheat	Corn-hog	Rice	Peanuts	Total
Archer	78,661.10	15,413.06	25,804.04	5,955.66			125,833.86
Baylor	323,439.03	90,914.13	48,804.03	9,638.78			472,793.97
Clay	516,834.31	67,735.99	58,119.41	38,613.43			681,303.14
Cooke	329,824.89	82,277.39	154,996.37	65,686.80		1,384.98	634,170.43
Denton	692,030.65	166,697.01	131,913.24	74,877.09		9,352.12	1,074,870.11
Foard	289,817.66	60,916.89	107,109.34	7,258.51			465,102.40
Hardeman	642,457.76	124,940.45	73,987.57	16,938.28			858,334.06
Jack	97,089.45	26,627.41	8,485.28	25,222.55		1,185.80	158,610.49
Knox	685,586.13	113,979.49	9,204.07	18,375.87			827,145.56
Montague	270,799.64	32,863.77		35,670.21		6,210.42	345,544.04
Throckmorton	127,637.00	32,364.71	15,450.75	7,773.46			183,225.92
Wichita	420,388.73	35,356.28	38,167.64	23,083.20			516,995.85
Wilbarger	956,104.27	158,255.55	9,274.67	3,447.06			1,127,081.55
Wise	158,343.11	37,263.62	28,121.57	64,533.49		22,422.88	310,684.67
Young	296,367.73	84,019.64	26,163.23	21,814.05			428,364.65
District total	5,885,381.46	1,129,625.39	735,611.21	418,886.44		40,556.20	8,210,060.70
State total	110,183,659.30	20,212,705.92	14,394,637.61	6,333,144.79	1,845,153.11	355,838.37	153,325,139.10

RENTAL AND BENEFIT PAYMENTS

The rental and benefit payments, profits on cotton options and price-adjustment payments made in Texas, and farm value of the Texas cotton crops, 1932-35, as shown by Department of Agriculture records, is as follows:

Rental and benefit payments

1933 program	\$43,441,910
Profits on cotton options	20,300,461
1934 program	34,705,914
1935 program	32,193,262
1935 price-adjustment payments	15,130,000

Total payments..... 145,771,537

¹ Through Feb. 29, 1936.

² Estimated.

	1932	1933	1934	1935
Farm value of lint and seed	\$158,343,000	\$245,466,000	\$188,286,000	\$209,236,000
Rental and benefit payments and profits on options		63,742,371	34,705,914	47,323,252
Farm value plus payments	158,343,000	309,208,371	222,991,914	256,559,252

Percent increase in 1935 farm value plus payments over 1932 farm value, 62.9.

WICHITA GARDENS AND WICHITA VALLEY COLONY PROJECTS

I was the first to suggest to the citizens of Wichita Falls the subsistence homestead project, which up to that time was unknown to any of them. After considerable work we were able to finally secure this project, which provides homes for 62 families and sufficient ground, outhouses, and so forth, to supplement low incomes to assist these families in earning their livelihood. The total estimated Government cost of the Wichita Gardens is approximately \$200,000.

I have been glad to assist in securing the approval of the Wichita Valley Farms, which involves an acquisition of approximately 5,300 acres of farm land in Wichita County. Options have been taken on 3,430 acres of land at a cost of \$123,381. This project is designed for the resettlement of 93 farm families on farm units averaging about 52 acres each.

creased the gross incomes of the farmers from \$5,337,000,000 in 1932 to \$8,110,000,000 in 1935, and their net income from \$1,473,000,000 in 1932 to \$3,550,000,000 in 1935.

It will be interesting to compare the records of the last 3 years of the Old Deal with the first 3 years of the New Deal as we go along. Time of comparison dates is March 1, 1930, to March 1, 1933, of the Old Deal and March 1, 1933, to March 1, 1936, under the New Deal.

Cotton declined 61 percent to 5.9 cents per pound under the Hoover administration and advanced 92 percent to 11.35 cents per pound under the Roosevelt administration. Wheat declined 59 percent to 48 cents per bushel under Hoover and advanced 111 percent to \$1.015 per bushel under Roosevelt. Corn declined 73 percent to 24 cents per bushel under Hoover and advanced 152 percent to 68.87 cents per bushel under Roosevelt.

PAYMENTS MADE UNDER A. A. A.

The rental and benefit payments and profits on cotton options made in connection with the commodity program from the beginning of those programs under this administration through February 29, 1936, for the Thirteenth Congressional District and the State of Texas are as follows:

The total estimated Government cost of the Wichita Valley Farms is approximately \$862,400.

The following loans, grants, and farm-debt adjustments have been made by the Resettlement Administration for my district:

TEXAS (THIRTEENTH DISTRICT)

Total loans by Resettlement Administration, as of May 1, 1936

County	Number of farmers to whom loans have been made	Amount of approved loans	Unpaid balance
Archer	15	\$4,273.99	\$1,685.42
Baylor	27	9,077.94	3,496.84
Clay	133	41,348.48	11,090.20
Cooke	370	89,933.23	25,248.18
Denton	299	89,882.53	24,550.13
Foard	55	11,233.17	3,806.95
Hardeman	130	25,245.25	8,409.42
Jack	61	30,304.30	12,940.96
Knox	15	5,235.45	1,566.00
Montague	214	61,573.88	23,422.24
Throckmorton	3	511.20	212.70
Wichita	55	21,303.73	6,067.07
Wilbarger	67	32,405.97	10,942.81
Wise	169	65,668.03	28,923.06
Young	32	13,223.41	8,410.93
Total (thirteenth district)	1,645	501,220.56	170,772.91

Total grants, as of May 1, 1936

County	Number of farmers to whom grants have been made	Amount of grants made
Archer	24	\$1,100.00
Baylor	24	902.00
Clay	122	5,650.00
Cooke	156	8,028.50
Denton	159	8,641.40

Total grants, as of May 1, 1936—Continued

County	Number of farmers to whom grants have been made	Amount of grants made
Foard	43	\$2,069.00
Hardeman	86	4,211.00
Jack	52	3,201.00
Knox	8	296.00
Montague	229	8,650.00
Throckmorton	6	260.00
Wichita	68	3,055.00
Wilbarger	58	2,393.00
Wise	166	7,263.00
Young	71	2,686.00
Total (thirteenth district)	1,272	58,408.90

Total farm debt adjustment cases, as of May 1, 1936

County	Total number of cases	Cases adjusted	Original indebtedness	Debt reduction	Taxes paid	Number of acres affected
Archer	4	3	\$10,602	\$50	\$157	1,015
Baylor	14	9	24,956	2,327	31	1,766
Clay	59	54	147,220	15,824	866	13,078
Cooke	22	13	4,727	290	50	808
Denton	46	16	53,096	11,377	2,776	2,722
Foard	2	1	2,000	900		132
Hardeman	8					
Jack	6	4	479		149	240
Knox	9	6	31,785	155	252	1,805
Montague	32	14	17,958	597	491	1,539
Throckmorton	2	2	9,644	500	138	960
Wichita	16	11	3,105	825		1,270
Wilbarger	3					
Wise	27	15	74,374	3,325	1,573	2,259
Young	18	6	14,499	3,793	305	603
Total	268	154	394,345	39,963	6,788	28,197

LOANS MADE BY FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

For the first time in the history of the Nation, under legislation worked out by this administration, a complete system of farm credit has been set up separate and apart from the old commercial bank-credit system.

The Farm Credit Administration, through its different agencies, has loaned \$187,208,160 in the State of Texas from May 1, 1933, to March 31, 1936. The Federal land bank and the land-bank commissioner has made a total of 3,358 loans in my district and a total of \$8,134,700.

From January 1, 1933, through September 30, 1935, there were 4,770 emergency crop and feed loans made in my district, amounting to \$376,710, and 3,469 drought loans totaling \$305,027.

FARM-MORTGAGE FORECLOSURES

This administration, through legislation enacted, has refinanced about 750,000 farm mortgages, totaling \$3,230,308,000, at a savings in interest rates over previous rates charged of more than \$50,000,000 as compared to previous interest rates charged for the same service.

The following table shows the number of foreclosures and similar transactions per thousand farms during the last several years:

Foreclosures on farm real estate—number per 1,000

1926-30 (average)	16.7
1931	18.7
1932	28.4
1933	38.8
1934	28.0
1935	21.0

While we see from the above table that we have made great progress under this administration in reducing the number of foreclosures on farms and savings made the farmer in lower interest rates, however, as compared to the interest rates paid by industry there is still great room for improvement in lowering the interest rate for the farmer, small businessman, and consumer. Our big problem is redistribution of buying power and continued high rates on the fixed charges, interest, taxes, and so forth, will continue to retard recovery.

SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE

During this administration there has been located in the State of Texas 77 camps under the Soil Conservation Service program. There has been expended in Texas under this program to May 1, this year, \$41,071,000; there has been allotted to dependent relatives of enrollees in these camps in Texas, the sum of \$9,722,000; there has been 62,671 Texas boys enrolled in these camps together with 7,017 officers and necessary employees for operating said camps in Texas. Under this soil-conservation program to January 1, 1936, there has been erected in Texas 7,000 bridges and 2,000 old bridges repaired and maintained; they have built 1,200 miles of telephone lines; over 3,000 truck trails have been constructed and 27,000 erosion-check dams; about 5,000 terrace outlet structures have been built, about 4,600,000 forest trees set out. Timber standing on about 86,000 acres of forest land has been thinned; rodent control over 101,000 acres of land and timber set out over 168,000 acres.

There were six of these soil-conservation camps located in my district, as follows: Gainesville, Denton, Boyd, Jacksboro, Graham, and Bowie.

Thus we find from reviewing the above figures that under this administration there has been expended in the thirteenth district by the Government, on account of these C. C. C. camps, approximately \$3,200,958.

VETERANS' LEGISLATION

After a 7-year battle this Congress finally passed a bill to pay the World War veteran the balance due him on his adjusted-service certificate. This legislation passed the House on January 24 by a vote of 325 to 61, and passed the Senate on January 27 by a vote of 76 to 19. Thus nearly 18 years after the close of the war, the veteran is finally paid the balance granted him for service rendered his country.

In keeping with my campaign pledges, I gladly supported and voted for the final passage of this measure. I have always favored paying this debt through the issuance of non-interest-bearing currency. However, since it seems we could not secure enough votes in the Senate to pass such a measure this session, there was nothing left to do but to give the money changers their "pound of flesh" and pay same through a bond issue which will cost the taxpayers an additional \$2,000,000,000 in interest, because of their forcing the issuance of interest-bearing bonds.

The payment of the soldier the balance due on his adjusted-service certificate will distribute about \$83,000,000 in Texas and about \$4,323,733.13 in the Thirteenth Congressional District, as follows:

Archer County, \$143,110.16; Baylor, \$109,623.21; Clay, \$214,946.01; Cooke, \$356,681.81; Denton, \$485,043.52; Foard, \$93,323.07; Hardeman, \$214,753.90; Jack, \$133,681.79; Knox, \$167,996.91; Montague, \$283,131.71; Throckmorton, \$77,628.84; Wilbarger, \$363,228.47; Wise, \$283,412.49; Wichita, \$1,099,719.65; Young, \$297,451.51.

Two years ago I was bitterly opposed, as you know, by the special interests in my candidacy for reelection to a second term because I had dared to actively support not only what was fair and just for the soldier but because I had voted for what was right for the plain people. During my entire legislative career of 4 years in the Texas House of Representatives, 4 years in the State senate, and 4 years as your Representative in Congress, I have always actively fought and voted for what would best protect the rights of the greater number.

During this administration there has been enacted into law or restored by Executive order practically all of the rights taken from the soldier due to the enactment of the so-called economy bill, which took from the soldier and others many of their rights.

INDUSTRY

Between 1921, the low point of the post-war depression, and 1929, when industrial activity was at its peak for the post-war years, the number of people engaged in all industries increased from 40,008,000 to 46,800,000; estimated national income increased from \$58,271,000,000 to \$78,632,000,000, and the value of manufacturing production increased from

\$43,653,283,000 to \$69,960,910,000. The national income decreased from \$78,576,000,000 in 1929 to \$44,431,000,000 in 1933, and the value of manufacturing production decreased from \$69,960,910,000 in 1929 to \$31,358,840,000 in 1933.

The export and import trade of the United States followed the same general course, as shown in the table which follows:

Exports and imports

Year	Domestic exports	Domestic imports
1921	4,378,938,000	2,509,148,000
1925	4,818,722,000	4,226,589,000
1929	5,157,083,000	4,399,361,000
1933	1,647,220,000	1,449,559,000

Total exports declined 56 percent under the Hoover administration and advanced 33 percent under the Roosevelt administration.

Under the Hoover administration business in general dropped 64.2 percent of normal, while under the Roosevelt administration general business went up to 94.1 percent of the 1923-25 average. Listed stocks on the average declined 75 percent under the Hoover administration and advanced 134 percent under the Roosevelt administration. Listed bonds on the average declined 22 percent under the Hoover administration and advanced 22 percent under the Roosevelt administration.

Wholesale prices declined 34 percent under the Hoover administration and advanced 33 percent under the Roosevelt administration. Automobile registrations declined 66 percent under the Hoover administration and advanced 326 percent under the Roosevelt administration; steel production declined 70 percent under the Hoover administration and advanced 257 percent under the Roosevelt administration. Industrial production declined 44 percent under the Hoover administration and advanced 51 percent under the Roosevelt administration.

LABOR

Under the Hoover administration, weekly pay rolls declined 53 percent to \$188,355,000, while the weekly pay rolls advanced 61 percent, to \$302,373,000, under the Roosevelt administration; on April 1, 1930, the records show 3,188,000 unemployed; on April 1, 1933, 13,178,000 unemployed, an increase in unemployment of 313 percent, while under the Roosevelt administration unemployment declined 36 percent, from 13,178,000 to 9,177,000 on December 1, 1935, and Mr. Green, of the American Federation of Labor, recently issued a statement showing further declines have placed unemployment now at less than 9,000,000.

Under the Hoover administration, families of millions of unemployed wage earners were facing starvation, receiving some aid from uncertain local charity and inadequate State relief, while the Hoover administration was loaning billions of dollars to the banks and railroads but did nothing for the destitute. Under the Roosevelt administration, destitute wage earners and their families are taken care of with Federal relief, the unemployed have been given work by the P. W. A., W. P. A., and other work-relief programs set up by this administration.

OUR CRITICS

Early this year the special-privileged crowd, headed up by the misnamed American Liberty League, the Crusaders, the United States Chamber of Commerce, the National Manufacturers' Association and their puppets, held one of their famous banquets in the Mayflower Hotel in Washington at which, according to the press, there were seated around the banquet tables men representing billions of dollars of wealth. It was the most openly brazen gathering of wealth ever assembled in Washington, to hear former Governor Al Smith, who has turned spokesman for this plutocratic crowd, caustically criticizing the Roosevelt administration. This same crowd was in Washington in March 1933, begging for immediate action to save their business and the country from revolution, which they knew in truth and in fact was "just around the corner." Now, we find them, as

soon as this administration has enacted legislation that has brought the country well on the road to recovery, and they are among the chief beneficiaries of this recovery program—we find them back in town, bitterly condemning the administration that made possible the saving of their business and the country from wrack and ruin.

BUSINESS IMPROVEMENT

Let us again look at the record and take a cross-section of representative business concerns of the Nation. Listed here are 32 of the leading corporations of the country and the status of their business in 1932 and 1935 compared:

	Profit (+) and deficit (—)	
	1932	1935
Building materials:		
U. S. Gypsum Co.	+\$1,599,416	+\$4,038,806
Johns-Manville	-2,829,062	+2,151,570
Certain-Teed Products	-1,600,077	+259,978
Glass:		
Pittsburgh Plate Glass	-60,737	+11,398,739
Owens-Illinois Co.	+2,067,886	+7,883,496
Mail-order houses:		
Montgomery Ward	-5,686,784	+9,161,054
Sears, Roebuck	-2,543,651	+15,020,551
Chemicals:		
E. I. du Pont de Nemours Co.	+26,234,779	+62,085,410
American Cyanamid Co.	+349,725	+7,738,825
Monsanto Chemical Co.	+1,012,698	+4,009,872
Communications: Western Union	-842,596	+5,258,078
Heavy machinery:		
Fairbanks Morse	-2,547,231	+1,465,799
Briggs Manufacturing Co.	-1,798,470	+9,258,046
Worthington Pump Co.	-1,668,287	-95,387
Mesta Machine Co.	+327,871	+3,114,527
Farm implements:		
International Harvester	-7,582,879	+19,618,238
J. I. Case Co.	-2,611,082	+1,804,835
Deere & Co.	-5,167,104	+6,105,452
Textiles:		
American Woolen Co.	-7,269,822	+2,740,598
Ludlow Manufacturing Associates	-400,632	1,509,045
Amusements: Radio-Keith-Orpheum	-10,695,503	+665,297
Steel:		
U. S. Steel Corporation	-71,175,705	+1,084,917
Crucible Steel Co.	-3,613,616	+1,267,176
National Steel Co.	+1,662,920	+11,136,000
Jones & Laughlin Corporation	-7,910,149	-398,716
Other metals:		
Anaconda Copper Co.	-7,571,946	+11,181,348
American Smelting & Refining Co.	-4,506,175	+13,768,153
Motors:		
Chrysler Corporation	-11,254,232	+34,975,000
General Motors Corporation	+165,000	+167,000,000
Oils:		
Phillips Petroleum Co.	+775,766	+13,421,703
Sun Oil Co.	+4,198,046	+7,100,239
Electrical supplies: Westinghouse Electric	-8,615,398	+11,983,390

SOCIAL SECURITY

Under the Hoover administration nothing whatever was done for the aged, the dependent children, maternal and child welfare, the blind, vocational rehabilitation, or unemployment compensation.

Under the Roosevelt administration a Committee on Economic Security, composed of the leading economists of the Nation, was appointed by the President to carefully study this great problem. This board reported back to the President and he recommended to Congress the Social Security Act, which was speedily enacted and became a law on August 14, 1935.

Under this social-security program the Federal Government for the first time has recognized the justness of dealing with these different questions from a national standpoint. This seven-point program of legislation enacted, while not claimed to be perfect and will no doubt need amendment from time to time, still it is a beginning, and it grants more real relief than any other legislation ever enacted by any nation in the world. Under the Social Security Act the Federal Government has appropriated sufficient funds to match State funds up to \$15 per month for the aged and for the blind and grants aid for dependent children on the basis of \$1 of Federal money for each \$2 expended by the State, but the Federal cost is not to exceed an amount equal to \$6 per month for the first child in the family and \$4 per month for each additional child. Proper provisions are made for maternal and child welfare, for the extension of public-health service as well as social rehabilitation. This act also

provides a Federal old-age-benefit system for employed persons to provide them with a definite income upon retirement. This system of old-age benefits will be financed chiefly by taxes upon both employer and employee; these taxes will be levied in equal amounts upon both employer and employee and will be collected by the Bureau of Internal Revenue. The tax upon employers and employees affects both alike, regardless of the number employed, and becomes effective January 1, 1937, and is equal to 1 percent of the pay roll in 1937, and the tax gradually increases to the amount equal to 3 percent of the pay roll in 1949. This tax is computed in respect of all wages paid not in excess of \$3,000.

The tax against employees is an income tax upon wages, payable by them, and the rates, scope, and effective dates of such tax are substantially the same as in the case of the pay-roll taxes against employers described in the preceding paragraph.

PENSION SCHEMES

The House Congressional Committee appointed to investigate the different pension schemes and the mode and manner these promoters work to filch nickels and dimes from the unsuspecting aged of the Nation, have day after day in the testimony given before their committee disclosed to what extent these schemes have been organized purely for selfish motives of those engaged, to enrich themselves at the expense of any who may contribute. This investigation has clearly shown that most of the leaders of these pension schemes have largely been controlled by either temporarily reformed persons with criminal records or by persons who have followed this form of racketeering and have preyed upon the unsuspecting over a long period of time.

Since Dr. Townsend has endorsed the Downey plan to provide pensions through the issuance of a \$10,000,000,000 bond issue and has abandoned his so-called Townsend plan, and has joined Gerald Smith in a share-the-wealth movement with a slogan "anything to defeat Roosevelt", this so-called Townsend-Downey-Smith political pension coalition is beginning to be better understood and the real purposes of the organization and consolidations back of these schemes is becoming better understood.

THE SPECIAL PRIVILEGE CROWD

The special privilege crowd throughout the years have managed to drag a red herring across the trail to try to divert the people's attention from the real fundamental issues of government onto some kind of fantastic scheme, and through such tactics continue their program of special privilege unmolested.

This administration has refused to be thus sidetracked. So far, of the many primary elections held in the different States throughout the Nation, not one single Townsend candidate, as such, for Congress has been nominated. Somehow it seems that 92 percent of the workers of the Nation seem to object to giving at least one-third of their earnings to the 8 percent for them and their families to live in luxury while those who work and earn this money live on beans.

I have always favored adequate old-age pensions, and have so voted. I voted for a pension of \$40 per month—see CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 6068, first session of the Seventy-fourth Congress. I agree with the leading economists Nation-wide that the so-called Townsend plan is not economically sound, and the leaders of this movement know or could easily know that their bill, H. R. 7154, now pending in Congress, to which they refer, would not provide more than \$40 per month through the 2-percent pyramided transaction sales tax, and the economists all agree that this consumption tax would increase the price of the necessities of life not less than 50 percent.

THE TOWNSEND TAX PLAN

The Townsend plan is not a pension plan at all. This administration has already carefully worked out a pension plan that is the law today. The Townsend plan is a tax plan whereby every person in this country to start with will pay a 2-percent pyramided transaction sales tax on every transaction made. This tax must be paid on all purchases and transactions made, including all necessities of life, and covers

every separate transaction from the producer through the merchant, jobber, wholesaler to the manufacturer, and back through the same endless chain to the consumer.

This is what it would cost the 92 percent of the people of the Nation to pay the 8 percent—10,000,000 aged eligibles—a \$200 pension per month at a cost of \$24,000,000,000 per year. The 1930 census shows we have a population of 122,775,046. Therefore to pay a \$200-per-month pension, we find, by dividing \$24,000,000,000 by 122,775,046, that it will require each and every man, woman, and child in the United States to pay an average of \$195.40 per year in new taxes. This is how this new sales-tax scheme would affect Texas and my district. It would require the citizens of Texas to pay, in new additional taxes, \$1,138,149,811, based on the 1930 census, and would require the different counties in my district to pay the following new additional taxes:

Archer County \$1,892,253.60, Baylor County \$1,444,477.20, Clay County \$2,722,093, Cooke County \$4,716,174.40, Denton County \$6,413,418.80, Foard County \$1,234,951, Hardeman County \$2,728,370.20, Jack County \$1,767,588.40, Knox County \$2,121,307.20, Montague County \$3,743,868.60, Throckmorton County \$1,026,436.20, Wichita County \$14,540,886.40; Wilbarger County \$4,802,736.60, Wise County \$3,737,381.20, and Young County \$3,933,011.20, making a total of new taxes for the Thirteenth Congressional District amounting to the sum of \$56,829,954 annually.

I have always favored raising revenue based on ability to pay rather than through sales taxes, which are always shifted onto and must be paid principally by the poor. The State of Texas is now operating with a tremendous deficit, and daily I am receiving letters from my constituents trying to secure relief under the home and farm loan authorities to save their homes and farms from foreclosure. Texas now has more than \$150,000,000 in delinquent taxes; I am unwilling to vote to saddle this additional annual tax burden upon the overburdened taxpayers of my district.

FISCAL AFFAIRS

The interest-bearing public indebtedness on March 31, 1933, was \$20,991,640,520, and on November 30, 1935, it had increased to \$28,482,013,190, an increase of \$7,490,372,670. While our bonded indebtedness has increased \$7,490,372,670, the records in the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation, and Home Owners' Loan Corporation showed a total of \$4,529,574,043 of guaranteed liabilities, leaving a net increased bonded indebtedness under this administration because of increased expenditures due to the depression amounting to the sum of \$2,960,798,627.

LOANS UNDER RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

There has been loaned to the counties of the Thirteenth Congressional District under legislation enacted by this administration the following sums:

Archer County, \$10,000; Baylor County, \$50,000; Clay County, \$58,285.78; Cooke County, \$400,000; Denton County, \$130,000; Foard County, \$18,000; Hardeman County, \$18,062.38; Jack County, \$50,000; Knox County, \$52,500; Montague County, \$16,000; Throckmorton County, \$27,500; Wichita County, \$1,041,643.32; Wilbarger County, \$84,505; and Young County, \$75,000, making a total of \$2,032,096.48 for the Thirteenth Congressional District.

Commercial failures increased enormously from 1929 to 1932, and they involved a total of \$502,831,000. In 1934, however, the liability in commercial failures totaled \$264,248,000.

FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION

During the past three Republican administrations 11,144 banks failed in the United States. Six thousand and fifty-four banks failed during the Hoover administration alone, losing to their depositors \$3,650,015,000.

The collapse of the bank structure of the Nation wrecked thousands of businessmen and caused thousands to be in want through no fault of their own. The first official act of this administration was to close all remaining banks until they could open on a safe and sound basis under legislation speedily enacted by this administration. The different amendments to our banking laws have placed the banks on a safe and sound basis and the enactment of the bank guar-

anty law has assured adequate protection of the depositors' money for the future.

There were but 57 bank failures in 1934 as compared to 179 from March 16 to December 31, 1933, and 449 bank failures from January 1 to March 1, 1933. There have been but five banks closed in Texas since the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation was created July 1, 1933, and under this administration but one bank has closed in the Thirteenth District.

FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION

Under the Hoover administration, homes were foreclosed throughout the Nation. Nothing was done to save the equities of millions in their homes which were sold under the auctioneer's hammer. Millions of homes were going to wrack and ruin because the owners were unable to finance needed repairs. Under this administration, legislation promptly enacted set up machinery that saved 995,531 homes through the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, which loaned \$3,005,000,000 to home owners, more than 90 percent of whom have taken care of their payments on time. The Federal Housing Administration was set up to take care of needed repairs and improvements on homes. Many millions of dollars have thus been loaned to make needed improvements. The Home Owners' Loan Corporation has made the following loans in the Thirteenth Congressional District of Texas: Archer, \$9,635; Baylor, \$54,640; Clay, \$41,898; Cooke, \$169,208; Denton, \$302,368; Foard, \$40,538; Hardeman, \$155,073; Jack, \$2,122; Knox, \$27,559; Montague, \$48,684; Wichita, \$1,556,223; Wilbarger, \$193,192; Wise, \$29,595; Young, \$58,438; making a total of \$2,689,173 loaned in my district.

The Federal Housing Administration, according to the latest information available, has transacted to May 1, 1936, \$781,197,015, \$365,609,493 of which has been for modernization and repair and \$260,772,061 home mortgages accepted for insurance. It has transacted the following business in the Thirteenth Congressional District of Texas.

Volume of Federal Housing Administration business in selected counties, State of Texas

County	Modernization notes insured through Apr. 30, 1936		Mortgages accepted for insurance through Mar. 31, 1936	
	Number	Amount	Number	Amount
Archer.....	39	\$10,470.89		
Baylor.....	39	8,828.45	1	\$2,500
Clay.....	18	4,982.24		
Cooke.....	57	20,098.37		
Denton.....	190	61,195.28	2	4,000
Foard.....	14	4,351.75	1	2,000
Hardeman.....	23	8,676.24		
Jack.....	50	19,001.37	1	2,000
Knox.....	9	3,882.92	1	3,250
Montague.....	61	24,313.62		
Throckmorton.....	38	7,429.18		
Wichita.....	730	226,727.04	36	105,455
Wilbarger.....	124	34,725.75	10	16,944
Wise.....	11	6,883.00	1	2,400
Young.....	101	31,151.23	2	8,500
Total.....	1,504	473,317.33	55	147,049
State total.....	33,829	11,108,322.16	2,353	8,591,815

¹ Based on reports received in Washington as of Mar. 31, 1936.

ELECTRIC POWER PROGRAM

Under the Hoover administration, power production declined 9 percent from 7.87 billion kilowatt-hours to 7.14 billion kilowatt-hours, while under this administration, power production increased 19 percent from 7.14 billion kilowatt-hours to 8.50 billion kilowatt-hours, yet the Power Trust crowd and their lobby have done everything possible through their campaign of propaganda over the radio and through the press, magazines, and so forth, to mislead the people into believing that the legislation enacted under this administration has destroyed the private utility business. As a matter of fact the enforced regulations under the Wheeler-Rayburn Act, the Securities Exchange Act and other legislation has caused the 19 percent advance in the sale of power production during this administration. Practically

all stocks of the Power Trust are hitting new highs daily and yet we find the Power Trust continues their program of bitterly opposing this administration in every way possible.

Bulletin No. 175, recently published by Judson King, director of the National Popular Government League, contains this statement, signed by 110 Members of the present Senate and House of Representatives:

THE UTILITY ISSUE IN 1936

Four years ago many Members of Congress in both House and Senate, without regard to party affiliations, warned the American people that the utility and banking interests were quietly working to control the nomination and election of candidates for the Presidency and the Congress.

Since a like effort is now being made, we repeat that warning and call special attention to two methods, among others, intensified in use since that time, to thwart public control of the utility "empires."

1. These corporations, and especially the holding companies, have redoubled their "back home" lobby and political activities, not only to dominate local governments, but also as a means of increasing their influence in national affairs. They seek to manipulate the nominating and election machinery without regard to party and usually employ concealed methods.

Second. They are brazenly utilizing the very machinery of the courts—legal procedures set up to insure exact justice among men—as instruments in their private warfare to postpone and frustrate either effective regulation or public ownership, undertaken in response to public demand, for low rates.

We refer not to legitimate suits testing valid legal questions, but to the endless number of abortive injunctions instigated for the sole purpose of delaying execution of the public will, after that will has been formally expressed through the processes of constitutional government, and often after contests have been decided against them in the highest courts.

These suits, seldom brought with hope of success, are paid for by consumers and charged to operating expenses. They drain public treasuries, exhaust public patience, and paralyze the machinery of Government. We submit that the multitude of suits of this character now pending against cities and towns, public-utility commissions, rural power districts, States, and Federal Government constitute a national scandal.

The power war is by no means ended. The efforts of private corporations to minimize its importance and deflect public attention must not prevail. It must be carried forward in this election, and all elections, until the American people are masters in their own house, and until they shall be freed from exorbitant and unjust charges, and until electricity shall be supplied to every urban and farm home in America, at rates the people can afford to pay.

We have a fair example of the Power Trust injunction suit tactics in the suits filed to stop the construction of a municipal light plant at Electra, Tex., which was approved by the vote of the people by more than 7 to 1, and injunction suits filed by the different power trust companies operating in Texas enjoining the construction of the Colorado and Brazos River power and flood control projects. There is already ample evidence available showing how the power trust has been able to secure control of the sale of power from the Colorado and Brazos River projects if and when constructed.

It will be remembered that at the request of the Wichita Falls City Council, and many citizens of Wichita Falls, last fall at my own expense I came to Washington and secured the approval of a loan and grant for the city of Wichita Falls for \$1,750,000 for the purpose of constructing a municipal light plant. The citizens throughout the Thirteenth District have been furnished with ample proof showing how the Power Trust crowd was able to thwart the will of the people and thus keep the citizens of Wichita Falls from enjoying lower light rates.

There is no reason under the sun why any community should be forced to pay from 2 to 10 times as much as it costs to produce electricity. So long as the people sit idly by and allow the utility crowd to control and dominate their city councils and other public officials, then just so long will the citizens be forced to continue to pay these unreasonable high utility rates.

No administration has tried harder to enact just legislation so as to place within the grasp of the local communities the power to force down utility rates than has this administration. The battle this administration has waged to bring about this result has been carried on through the Federal Power Commission, through the enactment of legislation setting up the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Rural Electrification Administration, the Electric Home and Farm

Authority, the Public Works Administration, and appropriations to carry on the big power projects scattered throughout the Nation. This is the first administration that has ever dared to do battle with the Power Trust to force lower power rates. All those of this administration who have supported the administration's utility program should have the earnest support of those who believe in honest fair dealings between man and man.

As shown by the records of the Public Works Administration, the power program of this Administration has been practically blocked through the many different injunction suits filed and other dilatory tactics used by the Power Trust to block this program set up by this administration for the purpose of furnishing ample yardsticks throughout the Nation to demonstrate what constitutes a fair price for the services rendered.

PUBLIC BUILDINGS UNDER P. W. A.

The Power Trust has graciously permitted this administration to loan money to construct public-school buildings, dormitories, auditoriums, sewerage and water systems, and school gymnasiums without filing injunction suits or forcing same to be blocked through pressure on the governing authorities. The Power Trust crowd have used their influence to have any and all such buildings constructed, especially if there was any possibility of that city filing an application for a municipal light plant that might interfere with their private monopolistic services which permit them to continue their excessive charges for electricity. The public-works program has thus been tremendously successful Nation-wide as it applies to the above-described buildings, and there has been or will be constructed under this program in the Thirteenth Congressional District in Texas buildings totaling \$10,721,750, as follows: Archer County, \$64,545; Baylor County, \$148,654; Clay County, \$83,635; Cooke County, \$492,250; Denton County, \$2,979,540; Foard County, \$46,272; Hardeman County, \$41,654; Jack County, \$137,095; Knox County, \$293,218; Montague County, \$361,900; Throckmorton County, \$47,272; Wilbarger County, \$294,222; Wichita County, \$5,153,695; Wise County, \$291,680; and Young County, 286,118.

There has been or will be constructed in the State of Texas under this program buildings amounting to the sum of \$255,630,740.

COMMUNICATIONS

The Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending January 30, 1935, reported an increase in postal receipts of \$44,062,136.17 over the previous year, giving the Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1935, a net surplus of \$4,964,149.31.

AIR MAIL—FOREIGN AND DOMESTIC

The domestic air-mail system has been completely overhauled during this administration; rates reduced from 13 cents to 6 cents per ounce; a new air-mail net work of routes has been established, increasing the air-mail mileage from 25,248 to 29,106 miles. The average rate of pay per mile under the present contract is 30.4 cents, as compared to 42.65 cents per mile prior to the annulling of all contracts in 1934, and 54 cents per mile for 1933.

Real adjustments have been made in the foreign air-mail system saving over \$1,000,000 per year in the cost of this service.

POST-OFFICE BUILDINGS

This administration has constructed 797 public buildings badly needed throughout the Nation and out of this program there has been constructed in the thirteenth district the following post-office buildings: Vernon, \$50,000; Graham, \$61,900; Nocona, \$64,000; and Bowie, \$53,500.

There has been an appropriation made for the immediate construction of post-office building at Quanah to cost \$80,000.

Funds have been allocated and one additional post-office building will be constructed in the thirteenth district as soon as the proper appropriation is made and site determined.

RELIEF ADMINISTRATION

All relief prior to this administration was cared for by State, local, and private agencies. Because of the chaotic

condition existing at the beginning of this administration, the demand came in unison from throughout the Nation that relief be administered by the Federal Government. Because of the great emergency existing, first the Civil Works Administration program was begun to put more men to work. Last year this method was changed and the Works Progress Administration established.

The total emergency relief expenditures covering State, county, and local needs from July 1, 1933, to December 1, 1935, were \$3,607,197,492, while expenditures for the Civil Works Administration were \$938,000,000. In January 1935, there were 4,614,965 families on relief. This number was decreased in November 1935, to 2,846,910 families.

The Works Progress Administration, set up May 6, 1935, and designed to give three and one-half million people work, had, on November 30, 1935, put 2,484,000 people to work.

ALIENS ILLEGALLY HERE SHOULD BE STRICKEN FROM RELIEF ROLLS

It was pointed out yesterday in debate the lack of provision in this legislation prohibiting aliens illegally in this country from sharing in this relief money.

I do not know how you feel about it, but personally I feel that aliens in this country illegally should not be allowed to share in this money that comes from the American taxpayers.

I feel, as pointed out yesterday, that something like 400,000 aliens on the relief roll being taken care of by the American taxpayers under this program should be allowed to wait until the Americans in this country are taken care of.

Mr. CURLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McFARLANE. For a question.

Mr. CURLEY. Does the gentleman know that there is a bill, introduced on January 29 in my name and referred to the Committee on Appropriations, for that very purpose?

Mr. McFARLANE. I know that the Veterans of Foreign Wars has tried to get the committee to do that, but up to this time they have refused to do it. I trust when that amendment is offered by the gentleman from New York it will be agreed to. I would like to offer the amendment myself. I think many men on the floor of this House feel keenly the need of such an amendment. I think we should unanimously vote for it.

Mr. CURLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McFARLANE. Yes.

Mr. CURLEY. Does the gentleman know that in a recent investigation in the city of New York, 30,000 aliens were found to be on relief rolls in that city?

Mr. McFARLANE. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. DONDERO. But I understand that all points of order are waived against the bill. How can such an amendment be made germane at this time?

FUNDS FOR P. W. A. PROJECTS

Mr. McFARLANE. We will cross the creek when we reach it. There was a point made last night in the caucus on the proposition of earmarking some of this money for P. W. A., and while it would not be exactly ethical to tell what took place in the caucus, yet gentlemen have read in the morning papers something of what took place.

A point of order was raised to an amendment which I offered earmarking \$250,000,000 of this money for worthy P. W. A. projects that both Mr. Hopkins and Mr. Ickes admit would come under this program if we could get the money to put it through, and yet when I offered the amendment, the identical amendment submitted by Mr. BEITER, the only change being that I struck out \$700,000,000 and made it \$250,000,000, the Chair sustained the point of order that my amendment was not germane. If that is true, then the caucus was not germane, and we who signed the petition to call the caucus are completely out of order.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McFARLANE. Yes; for a question.

Mr. KNUTSON. I take it that it was a typical old-fashioned Democratic caucus.

Mr. McFARLANE. Yes; just like the typical old-fashioned Republican caucus.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McFARLANE. I yield for a question.

Mr. RICH. Much has been said during the past year about spending this money for relief under Mr. Hopkins and that we were not going to do it again this year, yet here comes a bill just like the old one. Why did not the Democratic caucus change it after you talked so much about doing so?

Mr. McFARLANE. The gentleman's question answers itself. I called the attention of the Committee on Appropriations, for instance, to 33 different projects pending in my district, as above pointed out, and my district is not different largely from others. They are worth-while projects that have been approved that are now waiting funds from this legislation for their construction.

The people of my district are greatly interested in seeing that these projects are constructed. I know there is no finer piece of work being done in anybody's district anywhere than has been done under P. W. A. in my district. It is true that we have been slow in getting these projects started. It is true it has taken State legislation practically throughout the Nation. It has been slow all the way up and down the line in getting started under P. W. A., but all of these difficulties have been ironed out, these projects have been approved, they have been raised to their present status where now we are advised they are ready to immediately proceed with the construction of these projects if they are allowed to have funds under this legislation.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McFARLANE. Yes.

Mr. MAY. I believe it is the view of the gentleman from Texas, as it is my view, that if Mr. Ickes were allocated a few of the millions of this appropriation it would go into construction work that would stimulate the major industries of the country and give employment generally over the country to the people in industry as well as on the Government rolls.

Mr. McFARLANE. I think we understand the matter rather thoroughly, and that P. W. A. projects do not necessarily conflict with W. P. A. projects, where the citizens of a community want to put in about half the money that is necessary to build these worth-while projects, that are badly needed by them. It seems to me that we ought to allow them to do that, and in that way we will employ almost as many men under the P. W. A. program as you are employing under the W. P. A. program, with less money, when that is taken into consideration.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McFARLANE. Yes.

Mr. DONDERO. I am sure there are many Members on the floor who are in sympathy with the gentleman in respect to what he says about aliens. I think we all recognize it is a very difficult problem to handle, and what are we going to do with it? If 4 percent of this money goes to aliens, that would mean nearly \$280,000,000, or enough money to build the St. Lawrence seaway, which we are spending in that behalf.

Mr. McFARLANE. In answer to the gentleman I would say that the administrative cost of securing this information and stopping payment of these funds to aliens would be very little, because a few questions on the application blank they sign would get the necessary information to eliminate the aliens from the rolls. That is a matter of administration that could be easily worked out.

WORKS PROGRESS ADMINISTRATION

The Works Progress Administration has completed many worth-while projects throughout the Nation. There has been expended under this program in the Thirteenth Congressional District, a total of \$10,109,272.42 distributed as follows:

Archer County, \$295,594.65; Baylor County, \$218,652.62; Clay County, \$379,941.42; Cooke County, \$338,289.06; Denton

County, \$503,515.49; Foard County, \$186,603.28; Hardeman, \$462,623.36; Jack County, \$250,852.60; Knox County, \$179,338.87; Montague County, \$553,945.99; Throckmorton County, \$3,536,880.69; Wichita County, \$1,206,400.05; Wilbarger County, \$647,872.67; Wise County, \$533,376.10, and Young County, \$815,385.58.

SPECIAL PROGRAMS

In addition to the program of direct-work relief the Government has sponsored other special programs for relief from destitution as follows:

Transient program.

This division was set up to care for the destitute transient population and has cared for more than 300,000 destitutes in nonurban camps.

Self-helping cooperatives.

These organizations were the outgrowth of barter associations established by the unemployed themselves as a form of production for use. Through this program 100,000 persons were cared for.

NATIONAL YOUTH ADMINISTRATION

Under this program 933,189 pupils were cared for at a cost of \$48,866,067. Under this program there has been expended in the Thirteenth Congressional District in Texas a total of \$108,603 as follows:

Archer County, \$503; Baylor County, \$694; Clay County, \$914; Cooke County, \$4,483; Denton County, \$54,752; Foard County, \$2,102; Hardeman County, \$2,766; Jack County, \$564; Knox County, \$981; Montague County, \$2,050; Throckmorton County, \$968; Wichita County, \$23,772; Wilbarger County, \$6,828; Wise County, \$3,947; and Young County, \$3,339.

In conclusion let me point out that this bill carries an appropriation of \$2,364,229,712.53 principally to be expended for work relief. I have briefly called to your attention some of the many benefits brought about as a result of the legislative program worked out under this administration. I have gladly cooperated with the President and have voted for the program in its entirety as above set out.

COMMITTEE WORK

I have been active in my different committee assignments and have offered constructive suggestions whenever possible. For example as a member of the Naval Aircraft Investigating Committee, under permission of the President I inspected all the income-tax returns of the corporations selling the Navy equipment, and upon disclosures I made, I offered legislation to abolish the right of corporations to file consolidated income-tax returns (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pp. 6280-84, 73d Cong., 2d sess.). Senators NORRIS and BORAH used these facts I had thus disclosed in debating this matter in the Senate (see pp. 6409, 6466, 6559, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 73d Cong., 2d sess.) and the right to file consolidated returns was eliminated, thus saving the taxpayers about \$300,000,000 a year as the records show:

Corporate returns

1934	\$321,456,000
1935	465,370,000
1936 (estimated)	615,000,000

In addition to this, I have been active working and trying to not only stop some of the many leaks in our income-tax laws, but have tried to limit the profits of the war-materials manufacturers and to enact legislation that will keep them from annually "raiding the Treasury." I wish I had the time to cover these different subjects. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. McFARLANE] has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CULKIN].

Mr. CULKIN. Mr. Chairman, I had not intended to discuss this legislation, but it seems to me it is so fraught with danger to the future of this Nation that I would be lacking in my duty to my constituents if I did not address the House at least briefly on the subject.

This bill is another fatal delegation of the public purse to the Executive. Since these delegations began, and including this measure, the Congress will have handed over to the Executive \$11,732,000,000. There is no parallel to this performance since the birth of parliamentary government. The present-day records of Italy or Germany show no such delegation of power. I make the definite statement now—and it is made without fear of successful, honest contradiction—that at least \$6,000,000,000 of that money has been wasted and every cent of it has been colored with Democratic politics. All of it is now a charge upon the people of the United States and must be subsequently paid in taxes. Never have there been such indecent raids on the Treasury.

For example, take the State of Mississippi. Our good friend from that State [Mr. DOXEY] presented a very full and complete statement of what Mississippi had received since the beginning of this administration. According to his figures, Mississippi has received some \$260,784,000. Mississippi has paid in Federal taxes during that period approximately \$7,500,000. Much of that money was used for extraordinary, boondoggling activities and is completely wasted both to the Nation and, indeed, to that State. Yet Mississippi, according to Mr. DOXEY, is not satisfied, for, like *Oliver Twist*, "it is asking for more."

Mr. CURLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CULKIN. No. I am sorry; I cannot yield.

One phase of that Mississippi expenditure was discussed in an article in *Labor* several weeks ago. Under the urge of various chambers of commerce in the State of Mississippi, certain vocational schools were constructed by the Government. They were constructed as vocational schools, but they were in truth textile factories, and were built as such. Upon those so-called vocational schools, which represent a disbursement of approximately \$100,000, it was the definite intention to use the money and credit of the Northern States, or the States that are at least solvent with respect to the Treasury, to create industries and then steal, bodily, from the industrial States their going industries. That is not all. They made a contract, if you please, with a penal or reform institution in the State of Oklahoma, and they are going to import as help the "ladies" from this penal institution, under probation, into the State of Mississippi to compete with the free labor of the industrial States.

This administration is a continuing threat to going industry. Here is an example:

Agents from the T. V. A. area have gone into my State and have told industry there if they did not move down to the T. V. A. area they would begin to manufacture at Muscle Shoals the particular product made by them. It is such delegations of power as are proposed here today that makes such conditions possible. How long can this sort of thing continue and the present industrial States, which are paying the shot, retain their self-respect as members of this Union of States?

In this discussion attention has been called to the fact that some States have paid only 1 or 2 percent of their own relief. What a shameful situation that is! What a terrible reflection upon those areas which have not enough civic character and vitality to—at least in part—take care of their own. Where is their vaunted manhood gone? Their role is parasitic. They are without shame. They are intent only upon raiding the Federal Treasury to which they contribute nothing. They are heading the Federal Treasury into bankruptcy, the country into inflation, while they themselves are losing the manhood and character which was once the birthright of every American community.

How has this situation come about? Why have heretofore splendid Americans whose communities were formerly self-sustaining come to be almost a complete charge upon the Federal Treasury? I can tell you where, in my judgment, the fault lies. The President, while ostensibly delegating this authority to Mr. Hopkins, is himself the man behind the gun. The only one he listens to in this connection is "Field Marshal" Farley. This genial gentleman, trained in the Tammany school of politics, has no illusions about the political value of jobs or the use of money in politics. Far-

ley tells Hopkins where the money shall go. He tells Hopkins when the money shall go to a particular area. General Farley is an astute politician. One of his principles is that political parties, like armies, travel on their bellies. It is the intention of Farley to let loose this \$2,000,000,000 at election time in an endeavor to buy the election. Farley is true to his instincts when he does this, but it is a shameful thing, especially when done in the name of suffering humanity. I do not believe that this Republic can survive such procedure. If this plan of debauchery is successful, it will leave a stain on the heart and consciences of the American people which would unfit them for future participation in free institutions. My belief is that this procedure paves the way to fascism, where there is no personal liberty and where there will be no legislative branch of government. Such will be the fate of America if this procedure is successful. If Farley can buy the election with money taken under fraudulent pretenses from the Treasury, this Republic is at the end of its rope.

No man in this House is concerned about the welfare of unemployed more than I am. But to use their unhappy condition to reelect the present occupant of the White House is, to my mind, the depth of governmental depravity.

I listened carefully to the words of the distinguished and able gentleman from Virginia, the acting chairman of this committee. I have the greatest respect for him as a Member of the House. I do not agree with him, however, that this money is not to be used for political purposes. The fact is, and I repeat it, that it is the intention of the President and "Field Marshal" Farley to turn over this present appropriation and the billion dollars that are yet in the Treasury for political purposes, extracting only a modicum for relief. It is to be turned over to "Field Marshal" Farley to be used in the doubtful States to carry the election this fall.

In conclusion, I wish to emphasize with all the earnestness that I possess that these billions are not the President's and title to these funds does not go to the Democratic Party. It is not a fund to be used to continue his party in power. These moneys are a sacred trust. This vast sum and the national credit on which it is based was created by the past and present generation of toilers out of their blood and sweat. Theoretically at least it is dedicated to the cause of humanity. The situation calls for the best brains, the largest experience, and the highest idealism possible. The preservation of this Republic is more important than the election of either a Republican or Democratic President, but if politics are to dictate the disposal of this fund and chaos ensues, the blood is properly on the head of this Congress, which in an hour fraught with evil destiny ignores and basely surrenders to the Executive its manifest constitutional power.

Despite this threat against the life of the Republic I have faith in the American people provided they can be aroused to the dangers that confront the Nation. I hope and pray that every real American—North, South, East, and West—will participate actively in the November campaign and drive these raw deal money changers out of the temple of the Republic. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. CULKIN] has expired.

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the chairman of the committee [Mr. BUCHANAN].

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I wish it had been such that I could have gone into this bill fully and discussed it from beginning to end. I have had to save myself on this bill a little bit. As you have probably heard, I was confined to the hospital for 6 weeks, under orders of the doctor. When I was discharged I had to commence hearings on this bill almost immediately. I conducted them as rapidly and completely as possible. As a result we have approximately 2,000 pages of hearings for you to read in order to get a clear understanding of it.

I am under instructions from the doctors to work not over a certain number of hours a day. I am trying to comply with those instructions, but it is impossible.

My colleague, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM], has been kind enough to volunteer to sit throughout the hearings of the subcommittee, to assist in conducting the examination, and to assist in conducting this bill through the House. I appreciate it. He has done it in an able manner and I desire to compliment him on it.

I shall now discuss for a few minutes some of the important items in the bill. He has already told you we reduced the bill over \$23,000,000.

You have heard a little discussion of the P. W. A. and W. P. A. I am going to show you now why we have brought all this money to be expended by the Works Progress Administration; and let me state to start with that I have nothing in the world against P. W. A. I think a great deal of the Administrator—the Secretary of the Interior. During the first part of his administration I did not understand him. After holding hearings last year and hearing him I felt the Secretary of the Interior was in every respect an honest man [applause]; and that is what we want in the Government service.

Mr. Chairman, our purpose is to put the destitute unemployed to work, to give them employment, to give them something by which they may earn a living for themselves and those dependent on them. It is our purpose to put only those to work who are in actual need, to feed the hungry, and to clothe the naked. This bill, therefore, is centered largely around the purpose of relieving distress.

My friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], and he is my friend, and he is a good economist, he makes a good member of the Appropriations Committee, was out interviewing reporters this morning, saying we had appropriated \$11,000,000,000 in round figures for relief. He did not tell that a large part of our relief outlay is loaned money. Yes; we have appropriated a lot for relief and recovery. I am proud of it, because it fed the hungry and clothed the naked, saved farms, homes, railroads, banks, and so forth. I am proud of it because it places our great President as the greatest humanitarian in the world today. [Applause.]

Let us get down to the subject of the bill, however. I want to give some data as of March 28, 1936. All told, on that date, 3,763,334 were employed as the result of our big appropriation last year. Works Progress employed 2,884,161; Civilian Conservation Corps, 433,770; Public Works Administration, 77,464; all other Federal agencies, 367,939.

As for allotments of money by that date from that big appropriation, Works Progress had been allotted \$1,300,000,000; the Civilian Conservation Corps had been allotted \$526,500,000; Public Works Administration, \$447,500,000; all other Federal agencies, \$896,000,000. Thus, Works Progress, having been allotted 41 percent of all allotments made up to that time, had employed 76 percent of all who were employed. Civilian Conservation Corps, having been allotted 17 percent of all the allotments, had employed only 12 percent of all those employed. Public Works Administration had been allotted 14 percent of all allotments and employed only 2 percent of those who were employed. All other Federal agencies, having been allotted 28 percent of all allotments, employed only 10 percent of those who were employed. Just think of it! Works Progress allotted 41 percent and employed 76 percent of all those employed.

I listened with interest to my colleague the gentleman from Texas [Mr. McFARLANE] talking about the Public Works Administration and giving them money. Let me read you some figures: At the beginning of the fiscal year 1936—that is this year—P. W. A. had unexpended balances of about \$450,000,000. When we passed the big appropriation of \$4,880,000,000, Public Works received an additional allotment of \$450,000,000, making a total of \$900,000,000. It is estimated that when the end of this fiscal year comes only \$150,000,000 will have been paid out, leaving for actual expenditure by P. W. A. in the next fiscal year \$750,000,000. In addition to that in this bill and other bills passed by this Congress carried \$400,000,000 for heavy industry construction. These two sums, \$400,000,000 and \$750,000,000, gives to the heavy industry construction of the United States

\$1,150,000,000 for expenditure next year; yet we hear complaints about not being fair to heavy industry.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I yield.

Mr. MAY. Can the chairman tell us how much money remains available to the Secretary of the Interior as Administrator of the Public Works Administration?

Mr. BUCHANAN. It is now estimated that \$750,000,000 will remain unexpended on July 1 next.

Mr. MAY. That is from previous appropriations?

Mr. BUCHANAN. From the previous appropriation.

Mr. MAY. Does he get anything at all under the pending bill?

Mr. BUCHANAN. No.

Mr. MAY. I think \$750,000,000 is a pretty good allowance.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Not only that, he is authorized by law to sell the securities he takes from the cities and this constitutes a revolving fund with which he can operate.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I note that the bill, on page 21, appropriates for the Works Progress Administration \$1,425,000,000; that it allocates these funds, in a way, to different things and at the end contains the proviso that 15 percent of these allocations may be transferred from time to time to other classes. Under this provision would the Works Progress Administrator be allowed or authorized to transfer funds from his work to the Ickes outfit?

Mr. BUCHANAN. He would not be.

Mr. MAY. He would be confined to transferring from one of his own activities to another of his own activities?

Mr. BUCHANAN. We went into that question very carefully, drew the bill very carefully, and had a consultation with the Comptroller General's office. This I did myself; and I can assure this House, I want the Members to understand it, because they must not be misled, that every bit of this money must be spent under the guidance and direction of the Works Progress Administrator.

He may adopt a project from the P. W. A. as his own project and put men to work on it. He may adopt a project of Tugwell's and put men to work on it, but not a cent of money may be transferred to either one.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The sum of \$750,000,000 for the Public Works Administration is still available to its credit. Is it the contention that all of that money has been pledged or allocated?

Mr. BUCHANAN. All of it has been allocated because the President has taken all the unobligated money and the balances of other appropriations in order to give W. P. A. enough to continue giving work to the unemployed the balance of the present fiscal year.

Mr. BANKHEAD. So that the P. W. A. has no fund still available for other projects?

Mr. BUCHANAN. No. The only other funds involved may be in the sale of some securities.

Mr. BANKHEAD. But under the proposal that has been made it is expected that funds of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation may be available for public-works projects?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Certainly, if the Congress and the President adopt that as a policy. In my judgment, and it is a deliberate judgment, and a judgment formed from a full investigation of the facts, that in view of the recovery that has taken place in the country the time must soon come when we must stop lending so much money and spending so much money. [Applause.] That is where I am going to stand from this Congress on, and that is where I have stood during the present Congress.

Mr. KVALE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KVALE. I want to commend the Chairman of the Appropriations Committee for giving of his energy that he

should spare, but I want to ask just one question in all seriousness.

I have in mind certain projects throughout the Middle West that have been held up, delayed, retarded, withheld because an administrative ruling was made that they had to be completed within the present fiscal year before they could be approved.

Has the Committee on Appropriations in its further grant of funds given any consideration to such administrative limitations upon funds or projects? I should like to have a little statement in the Record from the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations upon that particular point because it is of great interest to myself and to the people I represent.

Mr. BUCHANAN. The committee gave no consideration to administrative provisions, restrictions, or rules governing the expenditure of this money. We felt that was an executive function and could be better dealt with and that the rules and regulations could be better prescribed by those who had charge of the spending of the money and knew more of the details of the projects than we did.

Mr. KVALE. Just one further question: Does the gentleman think that the administrative branch of the Government should be given full authority to withhold approval of projects simply because they cannot be completed within the particular fiscal year the plan contemplates?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I think so, and I will tell the gentleman why. I do not personally endorse the administration's expending emergency funds for projects that may take 10 years to finish or 5 years to finish, and which might involve the expenditure of hundreds of millions of dollars.

Mr. KVALE. The projects I had in mind would be completed at the most in 2 years but could not have been completed within the present fiscal year.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Oh, I do not think it should cover any project that may take 18 or 20 months to finish.

Mr. MAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. I am interested in one other matter, and the chairman of the Appropriations Committee has been very liberal in giving information. The gentleman will remember that at the beginning of this session a question arose in connection with another appropriation bill with regard to certain projects that had been authorized without the consent of the Congress. These projects were suspended by the Appropriations Committee, and will remain in suspension unless authorized in the future by the Congress. Is there anything in this legislation that prohibits or prevents the selection of new projects not authorized or contemplated by the Congress, either by the President or the Works Progress Administrator or the Public Works Administration?

Mr. BUCHANAN. There is nothing except as appears on the face of the bill where the projects have been enumerated.

Mr. MAVERICK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAVERICK. No provision was made in the original bill last year covering confirmation by the Senate of the State administrators. In the bill brought in this year I notice there is provision for confirmation by the Senate. Of course, that was in the bill last year when it came back from conference, but I am talking about the original bill. If we delegate to the Senate the confirmation of these officials, is it not turning over a power to them and making more or less a doormat of us?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Yes; but that was in the bill last year and we carried it forward in this bill. There was a serious controversy over that matter, and we did not want to have this held up in conference this year.

Mr. MAVERICK. We are delegating a power to the Senate which we are not required to do legally?

Mr. BUCHANAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. MAVERICK. I think it is a bad policy. We unnecessarily let the Senate have superior powers.

Mr. CROWE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. CROWE. What assurance have we of getting money from the R. F. C. for P. W. A. projects? They are pretty hard to get money out of. What assurance will there be?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I agree with the gentleman they are very hard to get money out of, and I further contend that they ought to be hard to get money out of. The country is recovering and will continue to recover. As it recovers, we must stop these tremendous expenditures. That is what I meant awhile ago when I said I was opposed to certain things.

Mr. CROWE. But some of these projects are good projects. What assurance have we that there will be help coming from the R. F. C.?

Mr. BUCHANAN. There is no assurance the R. F. C. will approve the projects. They are pretty hard to get approval from, I will say to the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, there is another question I want to discuss before concluding. I direct attention to page 99 of the bill to the section known as no. 7, which contains the following language:

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, none of the establishments or agencies named in subsection (b) of this section, shall after June 30, 1937, incur any obligations for administrative expenses, except pursuant to an annual appropriation specifically therefor by Congress.

[Applause.]

The section goes on to name 13 so-called independent agencies, 13 agencies that have been granted a revolving fund, 13 agencies about whose operation and handling of public funds this Congress knows nothing. No regular committee of the House is called upon to investigate them. Of course, we could order a special investigation, but, God knows, I am sick of special investigations. This provision brings them within the jurisdiction of the Congress and makes them come to Congress with regular estimates and ask for the money necessary to administer their respective corporations or organizations.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Yes.

Mr. MAY. Are they likewise required to come under the supervision and audit of the Comptroller General?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Some of them are.

Mr. MAY. Does not the gentleman think they should be?

Mr. BUCHANAN. When they come to the Congress to get their money they will be.

Mr. MAY. Why not restrict them by some such method now?

Mr. BUCHANAN. The gentleman need not be uneasy about that. When they come here for their appropriations, if they are not under the Comptroller General, the Committee will put them under him, because we believe in that system. We believe in every account being audited and we insist upon them being honest. I do not charge that any of them are dishonest, but I believe some of them are getting too much salary; I believe some of them have too many employees, and I do contend that they should be restricted to a reasonable and efficient force. Therefore, I am going to ask the Congress to adopt this section.

This is close to my heart because I believe it is essential to good administration and this is the first step with respect to their administrative expenses, including personnel and administration. The second step is to make all the money they receive payable into the Treasury and then if you want to create a special fund, you can do so, but require them to come to Congress for all appropriations, not only for operating expenses, but for their loans, if they are making loans, or doing anything else. Let the representatives of the people know what they are doing, because if we continue in this way we will have a government not by Congress, but a government by corporations, and God forbid we should ever have that. [Applause.]

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who have spoken or may hereafter speak on the bill may have permission to revise and extend their own remarks in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER].

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein quotations from various records.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine?

There was no objection.

THE STATE OF MAINE

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise primarily for the purpose of defending the State of Maine, much as I should like to indulge in a discussion of the philosophy of relief, and to present to the committee the very persuasive reasons why I believe we should adopt as a policy in extending relief the principle enunciated in the Democratic national platform of 4 years ago, the wisdom of which I have, through the sad experiences of the past 3 years, come fully to perceive. That platform declared for extension of aid by the Federal Government to the States and through them to be administered.

The State of Maine has been rather a football of politics as the only State with an early election, and a great deal of attention, therefore has been directed to its affairs. It has also served as what was conceived to be a horrible example of State administration, as a result of the indictment of the administrator selected in the State of Maine and of 15 of his more responsible associates. One has already been convicted and the rest are still under indictment, and an administrator has been appointed by Mr. Hopkins, who is now carrying on in rather glittering contrast to the previous administration. It has been urged that this establishes that Federal is far better than State administration of these affairs. Considerable attention was directed to this situation in the State of Maine in the questioning of Mr. Harry Hopkins before the subcommittee considering this resolution.

As one with executive experience in Maine, and a proper pride in its traditions, I should wish it to be clear that the administration which preceded the present one in Maine of the F. E. R. A. and the E. R. A., was not a State administration.

NO MAN'S LAND

In the first place, it is a matter of controversy even in the courts, as the Governor of Maine has testified before the court where these men were indicted that they were not State officials. Mr. Hopkins, meanwhile, has testified before a committee of the House that they were not Federal officials and were not appointed by him. The result is that they are left in a no man's land, apparently, responsible and accountable to no one. Hon. William R. Pattangall, until recently chief justice of our State, has suggested that the only mistake they made was in not taking all the funds that were intrusted to their care instead of permitting some of these funds to reach needy citizens of Maine.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BREWSTER. For a question; yes.

Mr. MORAN. I just want to ask a question to make it clear, so there will be no confusion in the minds of your constituents and mine and all the people of Maine. The charges the gentleman is now making are against the defunct Maine Emergency Relief Administration, and not against the Works Progress Administration?

Mr. BREWSTER. That is correct.

Mr. MORAN. And has the gentleman any criticism of the management, honesty, or integrity of the present Works Progress administrator, Albert Abrahamson, of Maine?

Mr. BREWSTER. I have not. It is being most admirably carried on. The former E. R. A. administration in Maine, however, was not selected by the executive authority of the State, as in the State of Maine the Governor and the executive council possess the full executive power. There are only two other States with similar machinery of administration.

It has been stated by students of government that we have eight governors in Maine, instead of one. The Executive Council of Maine is entirely Republican and the Governor is a Democrat.

Whatever may be thought about the controversy between Mr. Hopkins and Governor Brann as to the responsibility for the selection of the E. R. A. administrator, there is not a suggestion anywhere that the Executive Council of Maine, which was entirely Republican, was ever consulted or considered in any way. If the money had been turned over to the State of Maine for administration, as proposed by the minority, the Executive Council of the State of Maine would necessarily have been consulted in the selection of the E. R. A. administrator. In that event it is my firm conviction, from 4 years of executive experience in Maine, that no such wholesale indictment of an administration would have been required.

I am a good enough Jeffersonian Democrat to want to return the responsibilities of our Government, in accordance with our Democratic traditions, more nearly to the people. The more quickly that is done the more quickly we shall solve the problems with which we are faced. [Applause.]

The following excerpts from the record of the hearings before the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations will indicate the basis for this discussion:

INVESTIGATION OF CHARGES OF IRREGULARITIES IN EXPENDITURE OF RELIEF MONEY IN THE STATE OF MAINE

Mr. BACON. I want to refer now to a particular State: I understand that you made an investigation in a State as to the way these funds were spent. I refer to the State of Maine. In July the Governor of Maine announced in the papers that he had been allocated \$1,000,000. That was correct, because it appears that on July 17, 1934, he got \$638,400, and on September 4, 1934, he got \$429,779, or a total of over \$1,000,000. Now, who appointed the administrators of that F. E. R. A. money that was given to the Governor of Maine?

Mr. HOPKINS. I am not quite sure whether there was a board in Maine appointed by the Governor.

The CHAIRMAN. I think it was a board.

Mr. HOPKINS. Yes, sir; but I am not quite sure.

Mr. BACON. You did not appoint either the board or the administrator?

Mr. HOPKINS. No, sir; there was no Federal relief appointee in the State of Maine.

Mr. BACON. Then, whether it was a board or an administrator, the appointment was made by the Governor.

Mr. HOPKINS. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAYLOR. They were local people of that State?

Mr. HOPKINS. Yes, sir.

Mr. BACON. What I am getting at is the check-up you made as to this money that is allotted to the States. In the case of the State of Maine, the man who administered that money, John McDonough, was indicted, and his assistant, Martin, was indicted and is now serving time. You made an investigation of that whole situation?

Mr. HOPKINS. Yes, sir.

Mr. BACON. And you had a report.

Mr. HOPKINS. Charges were made of irregularities, and, according to our regular practice, when irregularities are charged, we made an investigation of the charges. Then, in the event there are irregularities established in the expenditure of the funds, we turn that information over to the local prosecuting officer. There was no Federal man involved in it.

In view of the fact that Federal funds had been granted to all States, we made an investigation wherever there were irregularities charged in the expenditure of relief money. We took the position that even though the funds legally became State funds once they were granted to the Governor, we still had a responsibility in seeing that the expenditures were made properly. We have always felt that we should investigate all charges.

Mr. BACON. That is what I wanted to bring out—that you do carefully investigate charges of irregularities in the handling of these funds.

Mr. HOPKINS. Yes, sir.

Mr. BACON. That is the only object of the questions I have asked with regard to the State of Maine, because I was informed that you made a very thorough investigation of those charges. I think it would be useful to us if you could furnish a copy of the report of that investigation as an example of how you check up on F. E. R. A. funds in the States where irregularities have been shown to exist.

Mr. HOPKINS. That is a confidential document that was turned over to the district attorney in the county where the irregularities took place. The indictments that resulted, or some of them, are still subject to trial.

Mr. BACON. In that case I do not want to press the inquiry. When Mr. McDonough was removed you sent an acting administrator up there to take charge of the situation—Paul Edwards?

Mr. HOPKINS. No—

Mr. BACON. How did he get there?

Mr. HOPKINS. He was given by the Governor a letter of appointment as acting administrator. Edwards was our field man who audited the accounts. He was made acting administrator by the Governor, not by me, because I would have no power to appoint an acting administrator.

Under W. P. A. these appointments are Federal appointments. Mr. Abramson was appointed W. P. A. administrator in Maine.

Mr. BACON. The reason I asked that question is that a number of citizens of Maine wrote to Members of Congress from Maine regarding the status of the Maine Coast Fisheries, Inc., who apparently were receiving a large amount of Federal funds.

Mr. HOPKINS. That was part of our investigation in this case.

Mr. BACON. Mr. Edwards wrote to Congressman Brewster, of Maine, and said:

"The Maine Coast Fisheries, Inc., is an independent cooperative and is not subject to the jurisdiction of this administration. In the past it has received unsecured loans from the Fishermen's Relief Corporation, a charitable organization formerly maintained by means of earmarked grants from the Federal Emergency Relief Administration. I am unable to state at this time just how much is owing the Fishermen's Relief Corporation from the Maine Coast Fisheries, as neither of these corporations is subject to supervision of the Federal or Maine Emergency Relief Administrations.

"For details regarding the financial status of the Maine Coast Fisheries I would have to refer you to the Governor or Rufus H. Stone, executive director of the Maine Coast Fisheries."

Mr. HOPKINS. I think Mr. Edwards is partly in error since previous to Edwards' appointment, the former administrator, Mr. McDonough, and his assistant, Mr. Salter, had been directors of these corporations and could control their policies since they could always refuse to grant further funds to them. However, there has been no direct legal control over the corporations by the relief administration, although we have had access to their accounts and books.

Mr. BACON. And you have access to the books of the Maine relief administration, and in your investigation you investigated this, among other situations?

Mr. HOPKINS. That was investigated thoroughly, and is part of this same case.

Mr. BACON. I brought this question up just to bring out the extent of the investigation of the handling by the States of some of this F. E. R. A. money.

Now, in connection with W. P. A., you have a closer control over it, and it is all handled from your office; that is, from the 1st of December it is a Federal proposition entirely?

Mr. HOPKINS. The W. P. A. has been a Federal enterprise from the beginning, and each W. P. A. administrator is a Federal appointee.

Mr. BACON. So that from now on you will have complete control of these funds and the auditing of them, and you do not rely on any State official?

Mr. HOPKINS. The Treasury handles our accounts, and the Procurement Division of the Treasury procures all our supplies.

Mr. BACON. I brought this Maine question up in order to get in my mind clearly the difference between F. E. R. A., and how it worked, and the new set-up of the W. P. A.

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. MORAN].

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, my colleague from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] has just called to the attention of the House the charges of graft and incompetence which have been made publicly against the Maine Emergency Relief Administration—known as the Maine E. R. A.—and which have resulted in several indictments, with one conviction so far, and the other cases still to be acted upon. In reply, let me say that I do not intend to stultify myself, on the floor of the United States House of Representatives or anywhere else, by condoning wrong-doing by public officials. But, I do intend to draw a few distinctions in order that the matter may be clarified.

First, let me point out that the criticism of my colleague [Mr. BREWSTER] was directed to the Maine E. R. A.; he frankly so stated when he courteously yielded to me a few minutes ago in answer to my specific inquiry on that exact point. The Maine E. R. A. no longer exists; his criticism therefore is directed against an organization that is dead and gone. This in no wise answers his criticisms against that organization, but this is a fact which should be understood. The real point is that his criticism lies against an organization that formerly existed in the State of Maine, and the persons indicted were not appointed by Mr. Harry Hopkins.

Second, I call attention to the fact that the criticism of my colleague [Mr. BREWSTER] was not directed against the present Federal organization for administering relief in Maine, namely, the Works Progress Administration. The record will show that when my colleague kindly yielded to me a few minutes ago, I propounded that precise inquiry,

and he frankly replied that he had no criticism whatever to offer against the present Works Progress Administration organization in Maine, and no criticism concerning the ability, integrity, honesty, efficiency, and management of that organization by the present Maine State administrator, Albert Abrahamson.

Third, the industry of my colleague [Mr. BREWSTER] in ascertaining the facts concerning the now defunct Maine E. R. A. has doubtless caused him to ascertain another interesting fact—the part played by Works Progress Administrator Harry Hopkins. I am confident that he is aware of the uncontrovertible fact that when the alleged wrongdoings were called to the attention of Administrator Hopkins, that he took the position that although the Maine E. R. A. was a State and not a Federal Government organization, that Federal funds granted to that State organization were involved, and therefore required his attention. Mr. Hopkins acted without fear or favor, energetically and promptly, and the evidence now before the Maine courts was obtained and presented to the Maine county attorneys having jurisdiction, by agents of Mr. Hopkins, at his direction. In addition, he forced the immediate removal of officials subsequently indicted. Here is a specific case where Mr. Hopkins practiced what he preaches; he is determined to have honest and efficient administration of relief; he will move heaven and earth to attain that ideal, and his action in the Maine situation so demonstrates. His record in the Maine situation is clear and not criticized by anybody. It will be noted that my colleague [Mr. BREWSTER] did not in any way criticize Mr. Harry Hopkins. Personally, I have no patience whatever with the current criticism of Harry Hopkins. He is an able, honest, and conscientious individual and public official; he assumed responsibility for a program that no human being could possibly administer without some mistakes and much criticism, and has done a marvelous piece of work. Our citizens on relief have every reason to be thankful that relief is administered by a man of such great ability and human sympathy and understanding as Harry Hopkins. Harry Hopkins is the kind of a man sorely needed in the public service of America.

Fourth. It is a source of real personal pleasure to me to have my colleague [Mr. BREWSTER] freely grant that he has no criticism to offer concerning the Maine Works Progress administrator, Albert Abrahamson. Mr. Abrahamson has performed a difficult task amazingly well. As one specific instance of Mr. Abrahamson's efficiency, he was given money enough to put 9,000 persons to work, and he put 12,000 to work with that same amount of money. No charge of incompetence, no assertion of graft, no breath of scandal, has touched his organization. Maine Republican newspapers specifically except the Maine W. P. A. when they make charges of boondoggling or inefficiencies against the New Deal. I do not know anything about the W. P. A. in other States, but I am informed concerning the W. P. A. in Maine. On the basis of that information I make the flat statement that no one in this House of Representatives, no one in the United States Senate, no informed person of responsibility in Maine has made, or can make, a single charge of incompetence, graft, or boondoggling against the Maine Works Progress Administration under the splendid administration of Albert Abrahamson.

Mr. CULKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORAN. I am glad to yield to my distinguished friend from New York.

Mr. CULKIN. One of the Works Progress projects for Maine involves the disbursement of \$7,000,000 for the elimination of mosquitoes. Are there mosquitoes in Maine?

Mr. MORAN. I will tell the gentleman there is no project of \$7,000,000 for mosquito elimination in Maine.

Mr. CULKIN. Is the gentleman sure of that?

Mr. MORAN. I am positive of that.

Mr. CULKIN. I understand there is.

Mr. MORAN. Let me state to the gentleman this fact, which may have caused his misunderstanding. Due to the efficiency of our State W. P. A. administrator, he has pre-

pared and sent to Washington projects presented by local officials totaling over \$125,000,000. Only \$2,600,000 was originally allocated to Maine, a sum later raised to \$3,600,000. The State administrator selected out of the total list of projects the comparatively few which he could undertake with the money allocated to Maine. Obviously, therefore, with only \$3,600,000 to spend on all projects all over Maine, he has not selected and will not select any single \$7,000,000 project.

Mr. KVALE. Is it not true that the mosquito season ends concurrently with the end of the fiscal year in Maine?

Mr. MORAN. I am bragging, and justifiably so, about the Maine Works Progress Administration, but I do not want to brag about mosquitoes in Maine.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Maine has expired.

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 3 minutes more.

Mr. MORAN. I have studied carefully the Maine Works Progress Administration and its projects; I spent my summer doing it. Of course, I do not know about every project that has been presented in Maine, but I do know about projects in operation all over the State, and I do not know of a single boondoggling project. I have repeatedly invited critics to name a single project of that character in Maine, and the invitation has not yet been accepted, which emphasizes the fact that we have an honest and efficient Works Progress Administration in Maine.

The objective of the Maine W. P. A. has been to render relief, but not all the relief needed. After all, this relief responsibility rests first on the local community, second on the State, and last on the Federal Government. This is the answer to the charge, based on misunderstanding, that the W. P. A. is not providing jobs for everybody who needs a job. Certainly it is not, and it should not; it is not the responsibility of the Federal Government to carry the whole load. To be specific, the Maine E. R. A. reported that there were 22,000 persons on relief in Maine. The Federal Government has undertaken to provide jobs for about 20,000 of that 22,000; certainly a fair and generous share of the burden for the Federal Government to assume. It is up to the local communities and the State, and private business, to do their share in shouldering this burden. With the immense sums now spent by the Federal Government to carry its share of the relief burden, which sums are severely criticized, certainly no one could expect the Federal Government to do more than it is now doing at consequent increased cost.

Our Republican friends offer the dole as an alternative. Three years ago they opposed the dole. They criticize the W. P. A. because it does not provide jobs for everybody who needs a job, but inconsistently criticize the cost of the present program, the cost of which would be immeasurably increased if jobs were provided for everybody by the Federal Government. Instead of increasing the Federal relief program we must retrench, but not at the expense of human suffering. The Federal Government must continue financial assistance as long as the local communities and States cannot handle the problem; we cannot allow people to starve. I know that Maine communities greatly need the W. P. A. aid they are receiving. I do not know what they could do without it. They could not meet their relief problem today without the aid of the W. P. A., and they know it. Maine communities should and do appreciate the Federal aid extended by the W. P. A. and know that aid is rendered honestly and efficiently.

Mr. BACON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I want to pay a very sincere tribute to the splendid work which the chairman of my committee, Mr. BUCHANAN, has done this year under great physical difficulties. In the early part of the session, as we all know, he was seriously sick. Therefore he has been under a tremendous strain in the past 6 weeks, holding hearings on this important bill. In spite of the strain he has always

been courteous and fair, and I am very glad, indeed, to serve under such a fine man as the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BUCHANAN].

ALIENS ILLEGALLY IN THE UNITED STATES

I want to discuss today some amendments that I will offer to the bill when it is read under the 5-minute rule. The gentleman from Texas, Mr. BLANTON, and the gentleman from Texas, Mr. McFARLANE, made reference in their talks yesterday and today to the effect that I would offer an amendment that would prevent aliens illegally here, who are subject to deportation, from being benefited by Federal funds to the detriment of American citizens, and aliens who are here legally. The amendment is germane. I will read it for the information of the Committee:

On page 99, after the section ending on line 3, insert a new section as follows:

"SEC. 7. No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be paid on account of any wage or salary to any alien within the continental limits of the United States, who is not in possession of valid evidence of legal admission to the United States."

That amendment has the approval of many patriotic societies and veterans' organizations.

At this point, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to include in my remarks a letter from the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The letter referred to is as follows:

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS,
Washington, D. C., May 7, 1936.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Federal funds should in no event be used to give Federal employment to aliens who are illegally in this country.

If Federal funds are insufficient—as they have been—to furnish employment to all unemployed residents, then such Federal employment as is available should preferably be furnished, (1) to American citizens and to those aliens who are now legally on their way to citizenship; and only after that (2) to those legally entered aliens who have failed to take out their first citizenship papers.

This limitation and preference as to Federal employment could be assured by an amendment to the deficiency appropriations bill now being considered in the House today, as follows:

"No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall knowingly be paid on account of any wage or salary—

"(1) To any alien, within the continental limits of the United States, who is not in possession of valid evidence of legal admission into the United States.

"(2) To any person, within the continental limits of the United States, who is not a citizen of the United States, or who, prior to the approval of this act by the President, does not possess a valid declaration of intention to become a citizen, except when no qualified person, as above defined, is available for any of the employment made possible under the provisions of this act.

"Provided, however, That this paragraph shall not become operative until 60 days after the approval of this act by the President."

Such a limitation and classification would soon become self-policing, self-enforcing. Local citizens would see to that. Therefore, to interpose the possible objection that such an amendment would necessitate any extra administration expense is not valid. Such a limitation would cause a saving to the Federal Government directly and indirectly, and would automatically help in the enforcement of other Federal laws. Please refer to page 1217 of hearings on deficiency appropriations.

We have bipartisan assurance that such an amendment will be offered from the floor of the House. Can anyone question its desirability and fairness? We earnestly hope that you will vote for such a limitation clause on this and on all other Federal appropriation bills.

Respectfully yours,

MILLARD W. RICE,
Legislative Representative.

Mr. BACON. My suggested amendment has the same general purpose as that suggested by Mr. Rice. I am heartily in favor of this proposal of the Veterans of Foreign Wars. I am afraid, however, that it will be subject to a point of order. I have, therefore, reworded it and changed the language, but not the purpose, so that it will not be subject to a point of order.

Mr. Chairman, I want to point out that this amendment does not affect in anyway an American citizen. It does not affect in anyway an alien who is here legally. It only affects and applies to aliens who are here illegally and therefore ineligible to citizenship.

I also want to call your attention to the fact that an alien who has smuggled himself into the United States, under our immigration laws, has committed a felony. I do not believe we want to displace American citizens who cannot obtain work relief, with aliens in this country who are here illegally and who, under the terms of a Federal act, have committed a felony by smuggling themselves into this country.

Mr. Hopkins has testified that if he is granted this \$1,425,000,000, only a little over 2,000,000 people will be able to receive work relief and relief under that appropriation. There are many more than 2,000,000 out of work who are in need of employment and who are destitute. This sum is not sufficient to take care of all the needy destitute. That being the case, it seems to me that American citizens and aliens who are here legally should have the first opportunity as against those who are here illegally. One word as to the alien who is here legally and who honestly is taking steps to win citizenship and to become a part of our country—he is in no way hurt by this amendment.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BACON. I wish to finish my statement first.

The alien of legal status in this country can easily produce the necessary evidence in four different ways: First, showing his declaration of intention to become a citizen. The minute he takes out his first papers he must show legal entry. The mere possession of his declaration of intention is proof positive that he is here legally; second, he can produce an identification card which has been issued to all aliens since July 1, 1928, and which was given him when he applied for a visa in his native country; third, he can produce a letter from the Department of Labor, through the port of entry where he arrived, and he can obtain this letter without it costing him a cent; fourth, he can produce a certificate of registry, if he has been registered under the act of March 2, 1929. Every alien here legally has at least three of these documents with him, and he can obtain any one of them without any expense whatsoever.

The amendment has been worded so that it is negative limitation. I am assured that it cannot possibly be subject to a point of order.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a brief question?

Mr. BACON. For a brief question; yes.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Will not the amendment which the gentleman intends to offer be tantamount to an alien registration act, as far as it applies to aliens on relief?

Mr. BACON. I do not think so.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. They will have to give all of these records.

Mr. BACON. An alien here legally carries at least two or three of these documents with him. All he has to do is to show them, and that is the end of it.

Mrs. O'DAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BACON. Gladly.

Mrs. O'DAY. Mr. Chairman, does the gentleman realize that prior to 1906, aliens came in sometimes at the rate of 5,000 a day, so I am told? At that time they did not have to have passports so long as they had the necessary amount of head tax, or whatever it was called, and did not have trachoma. Fulfilling these two conditions, they came in legally and were registered; but their names were very difficult for the clerks to write and they put down names that sounded something like the true names. Those immigrants who have gone back to find records of their legal entry have not been able to find them.

Mr. BACON. Of course, those aliens who came in prior to 1921 have been taken care of by the so-called Registry Act of March 2, 1929. All they have to do if they came in prior to that date is to prove they are people of good moral character. They do not have to prove legal entry. They can pay their head tax and register, and then are eligible for American citizenship. That was the purpose of that act. Now, if these aliens cannot prove they are people of good moral character, I do not think they ought to replace American citizens on the relief rolls.

POLITICS AND RELIEF

Another amendment I propose to offer will attempt to minimize and curtail the opportunities of using these relief funds for political purposes. When Mr. Hopkins was asked for information concerning politics in the administration of the Works Progress Administration he assumed the general attitude that he was not responsible for such circumstances if they existed. He told us that he could not be responsible for what some dumb politician may have done back in the different States. He seemed to feel that he had done his part when he had written to the local administrators informing them that campaign contributions were not to be solicited from employees on work-relief projects. He did not seem to realize that, inasmuch as all officials of the W. P. A. are Federal employees and not State or local employees, he was directly responsible for their actions.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MAPES] referred to the poll taken a little over a week ago, and he told us it shows that 76 percent of the American people believe there is politics in relief, that the relief money is being used for political purposes. The former Governor of Pennsylvania, Mr. Pinchot, wrote to the President, and I want to quote from his letter.

Washington has put in charge of work relief in Pennsylvania an utterly incompetent, political henchman of the notorious spoilsman Guffey. Today men are chosen for work relief on the basis of political advantage. W. P. A. in Pennsylvania, under Guffey's man, Jones, has been degraded into a Democratic pie counter.

Mr. Pinchot summed up this situation by saying:

Such prostitution of relief to politics is a stench in the nostrils of all decent people.

I do not think anybody will deny this last statement of Governor Pinchot.

I have in front of me a letter distributed from the Democratic campaign headquarters in Erie, Pa.:

DEAR FRIEND: We understand that you are at present employed under W. P. A. This employment we believe was only made possible through the Democratic Party. We are, therefore, asking you to assist us with a financial contribution. Please call on Ken Thompson, treasurer of the finance committee, Commerce Building, not later than Wednesday of this week. Your cooperation in the matter will be greatly appreciated.

Very truly yours,

DEMOCRATIC FINANCE COMMITTEE.

I have another letter here from Indiana, Pa. This was written to a woman who was working on relief and was addressed to her at the Community Center Building, Indiana, Pa.—another one from Pennsylvania:

DEAR MADAM: I am very much surprised that you have not responded to our previous letter requesting your contribution in the amount of \$28.08, to Indiana County democratic campaign committee, as I was sure that you appreciated your position to such an extent that you would make this contribution willingly and promptly. I must, however, now advise you that unless your contribution in the above amount is received promptly, it will be necessary to place your name on the list of those who will not be given consideration for any other appointment after the termination of the emergency relief work, which, as you know, will terminate in the near future.

Please make your check payable to A. Lucille Baun, treasurer, and mail the same to her at 402 Indiana Theater Building, Indiana, Pa.

Yours very truly,

HARRY W. FEE,

Chairman, Indiana County Democratic Committee.

Outstanding in the exposé are conditions in West Virginia. Out of the mouth of a man elected as a New Dealer comes the following:

The W. P. A. in West Virginia smells to high heaven, and it is my desire to work to clean up the rottenness that causes the political odor.

Senator HOLT, of West Virginia, who made this statement, adds:

There is only one way to identify the W. P. A. in West Virginia, and that is to say that it is a horrible mess.

With thousands begging for an opportunity to work, the big boys at the top sit back and take away money that should go to those at the bottom.

I charge the W. P. A. in West Virginia with being full of politics, with being extravagant and wasteful, and with a thorough censorship and spy system to prevent any complaints.

And again, Senator HOLT, citing how far the political set-up has gone, said that an administrative assistant to W. P. A. State Administrator McCullough, of West Virginia, sent out the following letter:

I hand you herewith a list of doctors in Ohio County. Kindly separate the Democrats from the Republicans and list them in order of priority, so we may notify our safety foremen and compensation men as to who is eligible to participate in case of injury.

Here is a letter purportedly signed by Charles McDonald, Democratic leader of the fourteenth ward of Philadelphia. It speaks for itself—and in volumes:

PHILADELPHIA, PA., March 14, 1936.

DEAR COMMITTEEMAN: Contact all houses in your division and get the names of all men on relief, also all those holding W. P. A. jobs. Urge them to register Democrat on March 25 or else lose position.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES McDONALD.

From Missouri comes another sordid tale. The Kansas City Star, reporting registration in Buchanan County, Mo., said:

The Democrats had an efficient, hard-working organization on the job, headed by Fred J. McGinnis, county supervisor of the W. P. A. It was estimated that 3,000 names and changes of address were put on the books today. W. P. A. workers were using more than a hundred motorcars to take registrants to the courthouse, and there were long lines waiting to register all day.

But Mr. Hopkins says there is no politics in W. P. A.

And in Kentucky allotments of Federal relief money were made 10 days before the election of November 5, 1935, in the amount of more than \$42,000,000 of W. P. A. and P. W. A. funds, and at the same time unsigned letters were mailed from Washington to voters on relief rolls declaring that—

President Roosevelt, a friend of the poor, provided relief so that those in need would not suffer.

And further—

Won't you help President Roosevelt and yourself by voting for Chandler on the Democratic ticket?

Chandler was the New Deal candidate for Governor.

To remedy this abuse of the proper use of relief funds, which is widely admitted and believed to be true, and which is substantially supported by the above evidence that I have read, I am going to propose two amendments to this bill which read as follows:

Amendment proposed by Mr. BACON: Page 21, line 12, after the word "Administration", strike out the comma and insert in lieu thereof the following: "cooperatively under States and local non-partisan boards to be appointed by the Governor of, or as may be determined by, each State and Territory, and the personnel thereof to be composed of citizens of the United States residing in the respective areas of administration."

This amendment would provide for the Works Progress Administration to administer cooperatively with State and local boards the moneys appropriated for relief and work relief in this bill.

My second proposal provides:

Amendment proposed by Mr. BACON, page 23, after the paragraph ending on line 9, insert a new paragraph, as follows:

"It shall be unlawful for any administrative officer or employee of the Works Progress Administration to influence or attempt to influence, through fear or intimidation, the vote of any person who is an applicant for, or who receives relief or work relief under the provisions of this act, in connection with any election at which Presidential and Vice Presidential electors or a Senator or Representative in, or a Delegate or Resident Commissioner to, Congress are to be voted for. Any such officer or employee who violates or consents to the violation of the provisions of this paragraph shall be fined not more than \$5,000 or imprisoned not more than 1 year, or both."

Those who sincerely believe that politics should be eliminated from relief and that politicians should not use money to relieve distress for political purposes should vote for these two amendments. Let us have a show-down. [Applause.] [Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PEARSON] such time as he may require.

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. Chairman, I desire to direct the attention of the Committee to pages 18, 19, and 20 of the bill

now under consideration, said portion of the bill dealing with appropriations for the Tennessee Valley Authority, and to ask your consideration of an amendment which will be proposed to this section by either the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. GREGORY] or myself.

You will note that the appropriation carried in this bill is for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of the original act of 1933 creating the Tennessee Valley Authority, as amended by the act approved during the last session of this Congress, including the continued construction of Norris, Wheeler, Pickwick, Gunter, and McReynolds Dams; the beginning of construction of Hiwassee, and the continuation of preliminary investigations as to the appropriate location and type of a dam on the lower Tennessee River.

When the Authority was first created, the directors individually and collectively visited the western section of Tennessee through which the lower Tennessee runs and by every act and inference led the people to believe that a dam was to be built on a site at or near what is known as Aurora. Since that time from month to month and year to year the assurances that this dam would be constructed have been continued, and it was not until recent months that it became apparent that the directors were postponing or delaying the construction of this particular dam for some purpose unknown to the people of that section.

It has been conceded from the outset and is still conceded by the Authority and its engineers that a dam on the lower Tennessee is absolutely necessary for a unified system of transportation on the river. In spite of this fact, each year Congress is asked to appropriate funds to begin the construction of other dams and all persuasion to get action on the lower Tennessee seems futile.

What is the reason for the delay, and should Congress acquiesce in it? The reason for the delay is the evident purpose of the directors of the Authority to eventually ask to have the Ohio River placed under its jurisdiction and to construct a dam across both rivers at or near Paducah, Ky., at a cost of approximately \$200,000,000. In order to eventually accomplish this objective, the directors apparently are purposely constructing all other alleged necessary dams on the river, putting Aurora Dam at the foot of the list so that at the psychological time this tremendous dam may be constructed and the Aurora project abandoned. This means, if Congress acquiesces in this delay, it will in the not far distant future be asked to make an appropriation for the beginning of this huge and expensive plant, constituting the first step in a far-reaching program on the Ohio River. Should Congress refuse to acquiesce it will mean that the Authority must complete its program on the Tennessee River before branching out into new and expensive fields. In my judgment, its activities should be confined to the Tennessee River until all work thereon has been completed and before permitting the Authority to launch a new "dream program" on some other river.

This conclusion on my part is not prompted by selfish motives. If the Ohio River should be developed and investigation reveals the fact that it is to the interest of the people affected by that river to have it developed, I shall certainly not interpose any objection to such a program, but I am convinced that no such program should be undertaken until the work on the Tennessee has been completed, and Congress should not permit such a thing to be done at this time.

I appeared before the committee in charge of this bill and explained this situation fully, requesting that a specific authorization for the beginning of the work at Aurora or Gilbertsville be carried in this bill, but received no assurance that my suggestion would be acted upon favorably.

About 2 weeks ago the Senators from Kentucky and Tennessee and the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. GREGORY] and myself had a conference with the President about this matter, explaining to him the necessity of beginning construction on a dam on the lower Tennessee at some point deemed sound from an engineering standpoint. I am sure I violate no confidence when I say that the President received our suggestion and request favorably and stated that

he had no objection to the bill specifically authorizing the beginning of work on the lower Tennessee Dam, and if necessary, would approve an increase in the allocation of \$650,000, which the Committee on Appropriations proposes to use in preliminary surveys.

The amendment which we propose to offer will authorize the beginning of construction work on this dam, and is offered in good faith and will not necessitate an increase in the amount of appropriation now provided in the bill. It will only authorize early action on a project which the directors of the Authority themselves admit must eventually be constructed.

In view of the fact that such action on the part of Congress will forestall and possibly prevent the fantastic and expensive proposal to build a dam costing \$200,000,000 across the Ohio and Tennessee Rivers, we feel that the adoption of this amendment will mean the saving of large sums of money to the taxpayers of this country and will be the means of bringing to a final conclusion construction work on the part of the Authority on the one river which it was created to develop. If the amendment is adopted, it will mean that the Authority by legislative enactment must keep its promises and assurances to the people of west Tennessee, and if they will not do that without legislative enactment, I say that it behooves Congress to force compliance by virtue of its affirmative action in this appropriation bill. [Applause.]

Mr. BOYLAN. Mr. Chairman, first I want to congratulate the House on the splendid committee it elected to take charge of appropriation matters. Of course, it has been said that self-praise is malodorous, but I am speaking of the committee membership outside of the present speaker.

Under the able leadership of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BUCHANAN], who addressed you this morning, the committee on deficiencies, consisting of the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. TAYLOR], the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OLIVER], the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. SANDLIN], the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM], the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BUCHANAN], the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], the gentleman from New York [Mr. BACON], the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. THURSTON], and myself, held extensive hearings on the various items included in the deficiency bill. May I say this was no small task? Ordinarily when a subcommittee handles matters entrusted to them, they are confined to a particular field or department, such as the War Department, the State Department, the Labor Department, Department of Justice, the Navy Department, or any of the other departments that may be assigned to a committee. That is all they are interested in. But the deficiency committee has to clear up and unite all the loose ends, all the deficiencies in appropriations for the current year or for previous years, and also in many instances make initial appropriations for new activities.

The bill before us for consideration today includes the legislative expenses of the House of Representatives, the expenses of the Government Printing Office, and the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, the expenses of the Architect of the Capitol, and 10 different departments of Government. In addition to that, in this bill we have to take care of 17 independent agencies, and it also includes payment of judgments and authorized claims, as well as expenditures covering relief, and also the expenses of the Social Security Act. This, it will be agreed, is no small job, and I may say that for practically 2½ months the committee met each day and gave their careful, open consideration to every item submitted to it without the slightest basis for animus or partisanship. Every item was considered on its merit.

Mr. Chairman, we have heard a lot of criticism about work-relief matters. The distinguished gentleman from New York who just preceded me, also a member of the committee, cited instances in some of the other States where slight irregularities had occurred. Mr. Hopkins was frank enough to say to the committee that he did not consider, nor did he claim, that his administration was perfect. We all know that any work of human endeavor is not perfect. We know that

men in all works of life have occasionally fallen by the way-side. We have even heard of distinguished lawyers being indicted, as well as other high professional men getting into trouble. Indeed, we would reach a millennium if that time had come when no more mistakes were made in any important function of life.

Mr. GIFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOYLAN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. GIFFORD. Recognizing that frailties may be expected in these particular cases, what about the universal slogan, "Don't bite the hand that feeds you." What about that? Is that political?

Mr. BOYLAN. That may be the gentleman's slogan. That is not the authorized slogan containing the stamp and seal of the relief department.

Mr. GIFFORD. No. It is not an indictable offense.

Mr. BOYLAN. Of course, the gentleman may have used that slogan on the wild and stormy shores of Cape Cod, perhaps, during the winter season.

Mr. GIFFORD. May I ask the gentleman if he proposes to use this W. P. A. money and treat it as a party measure and he himself make use of that slogan, "Don't bite the hand that feeds you"?

Mr. BOYLAN. I may say to the gentleman that I do not propose to use the slogan. I may further inform him that my influence with the W. P. A. has been of little or no moment. Why, I have not even been able to get a job for a mechanic in New York unless the man was on the relief rolls. I had many cases of skilled mechanics who did not want the odium of relief on them and who sought work; after complaining to Harry Hopkins and Colonel Westbrook, his assistant, I was not able to put one of them to work. I do not know how the gentleman fared on Cape Cod.

Mr. GIFFORD. Will the gentleman speak to the ethics of the subject?

Mr. MAVERICK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOYLAN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAVERICK. If the gentleman had a Massachusetts Republican move into his district, would he not try to get him a job in the W. P. A.?

Mr. BOYLAN. The first thing I would do would get him a job; then I know he would be grateful to me.

Mr. GIFFORD. I should like to have the gentleman explain the ethics of that slogan.

Mr. BOYLAN. The gentleman manufactured the slogan and he ought to know the philosophy of the ethics behind it. The gentleman springs it upon me unsuspectingly. I have not had time to digest it to see what the relative importance of one word to another is.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUM. I yield to the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. FOCHT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOYLAN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FOCHT. I should like to have the gentleman from New York define the character of ethics embodied in this sort of a situation which exists in my own county. If you want a job, you have to renounce your Republicanism and register as a Democrat. That has been proven in countless cases. What kind of a slogan does the gentleman call that?

Mr. BOYLAN. I will answer the gentleman by saying that he exerted every possible effort to bring a Federal penitentiary into his own neighborhood, and he succeeded in having it located and erected in the city of Lewisburg. Did he do that for any purpose? He did not do it to put Democrats to work.

Mr. FOCHT. No; many of the inmates of that penitentiary come from New York City, and some of them are Democrats, too.

Mr. BOYLAN. But they are not paid salaries. They are suffering there in durance vile, but your boys are getting paid to take care of and to watch them. Your townsmen

are being paid for food and supplies and the gentleman's town has grown in population at least 1,500 since the Federal penitentiary was located there.

Mr. FOCHT. It has fallen off very much, and no one in the town is employed at the penitentiary. The employees are mostly Democrats from out West and down South. I may say that I did not want the penitentiary there in the first place. The gentleman from New York was on the committee investigating prisons, he being very anxious to have additional ones erected suggested this site.

Mr. BOYLAN. No, indeed. The gentleman is in error and misquotes me. I am very fond of the gentleman, and I know he would not willingly misquote me.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOYLAN. Yes.

Mr. RICH. I believe if the gentleman made a visit to the Lewisburg Penitentiary and saw this institution he would realize that the people of the country would almost clamor to get into that place because of the beauty and grandeur of the institution.

Mr. BOYLAN. It is very funny that people should clamor to get into it, while all those who are in it are clamoring to get out. [Laughter.]

All this has to do merely with the ethics of the slogan referred to. What I want to discuss principally is the Social Security Act.

As you know, under the provisions of this measure, the Federal Government provides financial assistance to the States to help dependent children, to extend old-age assistance to men and women who reach the age of 65, to establish a Nation-wide system of financial and other assistance to the blind, to initiate services for the health of mothers and children, especially in rural areas, to establish and maintain adequate public-health services, to promote medical and surgical corrective service and care for crippled children, to promote local child-welfare services, especially in rural areas, and to expand vocational rehabilitation of the physically disabled.

I think there is nothing that we have accomplished in the Congress that we can be as proud of as the passage by the Congress of the Social Security Act last August.

In this appropriation we are providing practically the first big moneys to put this social-security service in operation. The only stigma on our country is the fact we have been a little late and a little slow in adopting this splendid, humanitarian service, but, as I have said, if you have accomplished nothing else in your congressional career, you can, at least, be proud and happy over having voted and appropriated funds for this splendid humanitarian service. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SEGER].

Mr. SEGER. Mr. Chairman, I have no doubt that this bill is going to pass, but I hope before final enactment it will contain a provision for local administration of relief and local distribution of relief funds. I want to make some observation of what is going on in my own State.

I have observed that since the States and local agencies took over relief in recent days, scores, yes, hundreds of names have been stricken off relief rolls as plain frauds. I have in mind one New Jersey city where several hundred names were erased within 3 days after local police made a house-to-house canvass, and it has also been reported to me that in many instances people have failed to call for checks awaiting them, and the obvious inference is that they fear the facts concerning their true financial status are known by local authorities. It has been discovered that many of these relief folks had substantial bank accounts, and their only explanation of their fraud was "We thought we would get in on the money while it lasted and the taking was good." In these cities the overseers of the poor or the poor-masters have been doing practically nothing. Yet they are the men who know better than anyone else the needs of the people in their respective cities and towns. Many are under tenure of office; they cannot be removed. They have been

drawing from \$500 to \$5,000 yearly, and about all they could do was sit idly by and wonder when it was all going to stop. I know one poormaster who for more than 2 years was given the job of stamping relief tickets. His valuable information about the real needs of applicants was never asked for, never used in any way. Wanton waste has resulted because of lack of this information. [Applause.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT].

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks, and to include therein certain statements from a prominent Missouri citizen.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I have in my hand a letter which should interest every Member of this House. It is dated Marshall, Mo., March 26, 1936, and is as follows:

Representative DEWEY SHORT,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: I am enclosing a copy of a letter I recently wrote Matt Murray, State W. P. A. director. As President Roosevelt has asked Congress to turn over to Mr. Hopkins \$3,000,000,000 to spend as he pleases, I am presuming you would be interested in my personal experiences as a contractor with W. P. A. This letter to Murray is long-winded, but I was anxious to be specific and not deal in generalities. In this letter I attempted to show:

1. The red tape and delays I have encountered in order to secure labor—the fallacy of not utilizing the efficient N. R. S. organization more fully.
2. The labor scale is all out of line with prevailing wages in this area, with the result that men on W. P. A. work do not wish to work on private contract work, farms, or P. W. A. and State highway work.
3. Ninety-five percent of W. P. A. employees are picked for political reasons rather than fitness for the job, and that three of the supervisors on one project, in Saline County, are running for political office.
4. Wives of well-to-do men are placed in charge of sewing circles, whereas there are plenty of efficient destitute women available for the work while wives of politicians are employed.
5. Inefficiency of work done and the poor class of work performed.
6. By permitting men to mess around on W. P. A. jobs has spoiled even the good workers and made loafers out of them.
7. With a million dollars of construction work going on in Saline County and contractors short of labor, yet four W. P. A. jobs are going full blast in this county.
8. W. P. A. certainly does not increase the morale of the men.
9. W. P. A. is poor politics, for it only provides for three and one-half million men and disregards another 7,000,000 men who are crying for work, but who are not on relief, and they are sore as hell.

I have quarries in Mercer, Daviess, Randolph, Johnson, St. Charles, Saline, Howard, and Cooper Counties and a material yard in Cole County, on the Missouri River, for my floating equipment, and am heavily interested in the largest quarry in Jackson County, and I have just recently made a trip around these counties, and the consensus of opinion of the residents to whom I talked about W. P. A. was one of utter disgust.

As a lifelong Democrat, how in the name of the Lord can I be expected to support an administration or a Congress that can produce no better plan for men on relief or the unemployed than one to blindly turn over to Hopkins and his crowd of theoretical star-gazers \$3,000,000,000 of the people's money to continue what is obviously a mess. What about the one-hundred-odd million Americans who are not on relief but are working every day and will have to pay the bill?

I hope this hasn't bored you, and I am sorry I seem to be so long-winded.

Yours very truly,

R. NEWTON McDOWELL, INC.,
R. NEWTON McDOWELL, President.

P. S.—Cannot Congress, on its own initiative, evolve a plan better than the present set-up?
(Copies to all Members of Congress from Missouri.)

Mr. Chairman, the opinions expressed in this communication were not uttered by a Republican but were spoken by a lifelong Democrat who comes from the heart and hot-bed of Missouri Democracy—Marshall in Saline County. He employs over 1,000 men and has an annual pay roll running into the millions of dollars; he is an outstanding citizen and a heavy taxpayer. Here we have a man honest enough, if you please, and patriotic enough to speak his mind freely. Like General Hagood, he is fearless.

My limited time will not allow me to cite one instance after another, not only in my district, but all over my State, as in other States of the Union, of the gross incompetency, the rank inefficiency, and, in many instances, the downright dishonesty in the administration of so-called relief, but which, in reality, is nothing more than an ignoble attempt to bribe the American electorate with the taxpayers' money. What perfidy! Such nefarious practice!

The Seventy-third Congress turned over to the President of the United States \$3,300,000,000. The first session of this Congress last year again, supinely and cowardly, surrendered the purse strings for which we ourselves are responsible to the Executive and gave him the enormous, stupendous, and appalling sum of \$4,880,000,000 which he and his cohorts might spend at any time on any kind of project which they themselves in their infallible and omnipotent wisdom might deem necessary.

Oh, it is interesting to sit over here and hear Members on the other side get up, as they have done for the last few weeks, telling us the depression is ended, that the emergency is over, and that prosperity has returned to the American people, but now they come in asking for \$1,500,000,000 more, notwithstanding that almost \$2,000,000,000 already given to the Executive remain unexpended.

We all know how it is going to be used. Why, down in my home town they not only threatened to take the people off of relief if they did not vote the Democratic ticket, but on the morning of the last election they hauled in voters at the expense of the taxpayers, and even violated the election laws by taking these people into the polling booths, seeing they voted the Democratic ticket, then handing them relief slips, and we had to have bloody fist fights before we put an end to this damnable and inexcusable practice. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. SHORT. I thank my good friend from New York for his boundless generosity. [Laughter and applause.]

I was out in St. Louis a few days ago when the American Workers Union, an organization of the unemployed, had a 47-hour vigil in the city hall. Here is a clipping from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch. They made this statement:

We protest against the police going about investigating families who have reported need for immediate food, intimidating families who are members of our organization and those who have reported their need to us. We protest emphatically against the police questioning these families in regard to their political affiliations.

I charge, and I charge deliberately, that those who sit in the seats of the mighty today are deliberately prolonging this depression while holding the club of hunger over the heads of destitute, helpless people, while certain plotters and usurpers are attempting to superimpose upon the American people, in their bewildered and confused state of mind, a system of government that spells destruction to democracy and will rob the people of this country of their cherished freedom. [Applause.]

The letter to Mr. M. S. Murray, referred to by Mr. SHORT, is as follows:

MARCH 16, 1936.

Mr. M. S. MURRAY,
State Administrator, W. P. A.,
Jefferson City, Mo.

MY DEAR MATT: Mr. Raymond Moley, a close friend of President Roosevelt, recently stated in an editorial in his magazine, Today, in substance, "That the chief liability the Democratic Party would have to carry in the coming campaign would be the waste and extravagant spending in the present relief set-up, etc."

I have nearly a million dollars of W. P. A. contracts in Saline and Howard Counties and have been operating our crushed-stone plant all winter in Cooper County and, as a result of my work, I have had a close-up of the W. P. A. workings in those counties and have become quite disgusted with the whole scheme of the W. P. A., with its waste and inefficiency, that I am going to give you a few reasons, based on my own personal contacts and observations, just why Mr. Moley is justified in his statement regarding the W. P. A.

The papers daily carry columns about the unemployed. However, since November 10 I have been short of labor, and today I am short about 100 men. In order to secure men I must forward a requisition to your labor office in Jefferson City, although

the National Reemployment Service have a very efficient office in Saline County which has been functioning for several years. This seems like an unnecessary procedure. Your labor office then notifies the N. R. S. office in the county in which I am working to furnish me with relief labor. You have two representatives in Saline County working out of the Sedalia office, and these men are supposed to inform the N. R. S. representative what men he may take off of a given W. P. A. job, and this is what has actually happened.

Men have been assigned to our work who live 25 miles from our job, with no means of transportation, and also a certain number have been physically unfit for hard work and have been rejected by a local physician employed by us to examine all of our employees. Some men have been too old and a number have been 17 or 18 years old—too light for our work. So we wind up with probably a third of a crew. Then it is necessary to file another requisition for labor through your Jefferson City office and go all over the same route. I discovered that the foreman on these W. P. A. jobs would release the poorest labor they had, which, of course, is human nature, but it causes us to fire a good many of them and then take the abuse that we are hard on the men, etc., which is decidedly not true, as we are getting only about 75 percent efficiency from the W. P. A. men transferred to our work after cutting out the weak ones.

The labor scale is all out of line. Under our contract we are to pay 30 cents per hour for common labor working a maximum of 130 hours per month, so if a man suffers no lost time on account of bad weather or for any other reason he may only earn in a month \$39 on our job, while the W. P. A. pays him \$35 per month for 3 or 4 days' work per week, irrespective of weather, shut-downs, etc. But, quite important, if he works for a contractor, he has to do a fair day's work or get fired; and on W. P. A. work—well, as one darky expressed it to me when I asked him what he was doing, he replied, "I am leaning on a pick out at a W. P. A. quarry near Marshall."

Farm labor in Saline County (one of the richest farm sections in the State) pays \$1 to \$1.50 per day (with no food or shelter furnished), and private construction will pay from \$2 to \$2.50 per day top. So no man will quit a W. P. A. job in that section for the jobs I have mentioned unless forced to do so.

I had a number of colored workers from Slater assigned to one of my jobs, and these men had been working on the W. P. A. job at Arrow Rock Park. One day, when I was at my job north of Gilliam, I was told by our superintendent that six of our best darkies had quit on their own volition, and I later found they had been put back to work on the W. P. A. job at Arrow Rock Park, and, God knows, they were not needed there, as the W. P. A. had 125 men messing around the park when 10 good workers could have accomplished the same results. If men may walk off my jobs or loaf to such an extent we will be compelled to discharge them and these men know they will be put back on W. P. A. work, it then becomes a farce for us to attempt to secure men through the W. P. A. But this is important—one of the foremen on this job is a member of the city council at Slater and is reported to control the colored vote of that city. Two other foremen are running for some city office, and the superintendent of the project is running for a county office. Now, all of these men are good fellows and I have nothing personally against them, but how on earth can politicians supervising these jobs, attempting to curry favor with the men in order to secure votes, be very hard-boiled about either making them work or forcing them to go on other projects against their wishes. It is just not in the cards, and the whole set-up, as I see it, is wrong, and from my knowledge of your personnel about 95 percent of your employees have been picked for political considerations rather than fitness for the job.

I know of one woman in Saline County, whose husband is one of the highest salaried men in the community, who was placed at the head of a sewing class for the sole reason that her husband controls some votes. There surely must be plenty of destitute women perfectly capable of handling a sewing class. Yet you are running a relief organization.

The Marshall special road district have a crew of men working at a W. P. A. quarry, and the plant consists of one small jaw crusher operated by a tractor. It has no secondary crusher or any screening facilities. The stone produced ranges from 3 inches in size down, with a very limited amount of fines, and would not meet the specifications of any road builder. In fact, the size stone they are producing will in time do more harm to the motorist than the mud road. The same is true of the plant operated by the county court in Saline County, and equally it is true of the quarries operated by the Franklin and Glasgow special road districts in Howard County, all operated with W. P. A. labor. The latter two quarries were placing on the road in zero weather the stone they produced. You know too much about building roads for me to explain what will happen to these roads; and for efficiency, by way of comparison, I am producing in my portable stone plants (specification material) four times the tonnage produced in the W. P. A. quarries and employing one-fourth the amount of labor. A further comparison of W. P. A. labor and private labor may be seen at my quarry at Blackwater, in Cooper County. At one end of my quarry my own men are working and at the other end of the quarry I am permitting the W. P. A. to place 30 men breaking rock. I receive a consideration of 50 cents per ton and furnish all the tools, equipment, etc., for permitting these men to work in the quarry. The W. P. A. workers remind me of a slow-motion picture show.

After men loaf along on a W. P. A. job for months and then are assigned to a private-contract job they get an awful jolt when they

are expected to do a day's work, and cry "slave driver" at the contractor. Last week five truck owners quit one of my jobs on which they were being paid the regulation wage as set up by the highway department, to wit, 5 cents per yard-mile haul plus 30 cents per hour to the driver. I asked one of these owners why he was quitting, and his reply was that he had an opportunity to go on a W. P. A. job at \$1.10 per hour and loaf along and burn about 2 gallons of gas per day. And so it goes. I could write pages and pages of similar circumstances, but you probably know all about it, and I am not blaming you in the slightest. Your own reputation is too well established, and I know you are not the father of the idea, but it is this sort of things that heaps criticism on the W. P. A.

As a contractor I may be prejudiced against this sort of work, but irrespective of any bias on my part, here are a few facts:

There is right now about \$1,000,000 of contract work going on in Saline County that is actually today short of labor, yet there are four W. P. A. jobs to my knowledge in operation in the county. In addition, there is a 7-mile stretch of State highway road (called Van Meter Park Road) that was let last November, but a work order has not been issued to start this project for the reason, given by the Bureau of Public Roads, that sufficient relief labor is not available. As I see it, there should not be any men in Saline County working on a W. P. A. job with a million dollars of construction work in progress, and I presume this same condition exists in many other counties. What a waste of the people's money! Further, looking at it from a cold-blooded political viewpoint, it is poor politics for this reason: I understand there are 3,200 men registered in Saline County out of a job, looking for work, and there are 600 men on relief. The men not on relief are not permitted to work on any Public Works Administration job or on a State highway job until all the relief labor is exhausted. I have had literally hundreds of these unemployed men this past winter appear at my jobs crying for work, but we were compelled to tell them they would have to get on relief to be sure of a job. These men are as sore as hell, and certainly any new plan should give equal opportunity to the man who has moved heaven and earth to remain off of relief.

The prattle put out that this work-relief plan increases the morale of men in lieu of placing them on a dole is all wrong, in my opinion. I fail to see where it increases their respect for their Government when they observe the waste and inefficiency that is permitted. Further, on any work I have, on which I am not restricted as to labor, I do not want any "ex" W. P. A. workers, as in most cases it has ruined the good workers and made loafers out of them.

Four winters ago I worked about a thousand men straight through the winter, working four 5-hour shifts, on work similar to what I am doing now in Saline County, and I always had men waiting in line for work and I was not at any time short of men, and, further, these men turned out just about 25 percent more work than I am securing from my present crews, but that was before the days of the W. P. A. Now I am constantly short of labor, and what I have is nothing to write home about.

How much better it would be to give a billion dollars to the Public Works Administration for worth-while projects handled by contractors in a businesslike manner and men who could not be taken care of in this work could be maintained on a dole under State supervision; and further I would immediately disband the whole W. P. A. program. However, to talk about disbanding the W. P. A. I feel like barking at the moon, as apparently even in the face of many of his close advisers, who feel about the W. P. A. as I do, the President will continue it. It seems Mr. Hopkins, in the President's eyes, is infallible when it comes to working out a plan to employ men, even though I am told Mr. Hopkins never met a pay roll in his life. I do not question for a minute Mr. Hopkins' sincerity or honesty of purpose, but he seems to forget that in addition to the 3,500,000 men on relief that there are at least another 7,000,000 men not on relief crying for work. What about them?

As I have said, my experience with the latter class is that they are as sore as hell. Further, to listen to Mr. Hopkins you would be led to believe the only class that required attention are those on relief, as he apparently has no consideration for the hundred million Americans that are still working every day and have to foot the bill for his extravagance and, in my opinion, wasteful method of relief.

I have been a Democrat all my life and in my small way a contributor to campaign funds, but it will be powerfully hard for me to reconcile myself to vote to continue an administration that has no better way of solving the unemployment and relief problem than a continuation of the W. P. A.

I am afraid, Matt, that in years to come when you are being complimented about all the worth-while things you have done in an efficient manner in your lifetime and someone mentions the year you headed the Missouri W. P. A., you will be the first one to say "Just skip that year—I did not organize that fool idea; I just attempted to help my friends out of a bad mess."

With best wishes, I am

Cordially,

R. NEWTON McDOWELL, INC.,
— President.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHURCH].

THE LAST STRUGGLE OF THE "HYPOCRATS" FOR THE RELIEF VOTE ON THE EVE OF ELECTION—POLITICAL TRICKERY CORRUPTS THIS NECESSARY EMERGENCY RELIEF MEASURE

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, the bill under consideration is officially labeled, "The first deficiency appropriation bill for 1936." This bill and copies of the hearings just became available at noon yesterday. As stated by the gentleman from Virginia, acting chairman of the committee in charge of the bill, we are expected to read, within 24 hours, more than 2,000 pages of testimony which includes the 100 pages of this bill. It is characteristic of this administration to give us the bill almost on the day that debate upon it opens. The opposition is never allowed to prepare appropriate amendments. Even a cursory glance, however, shows this bill to be the last struggle of the "hypocrats" for the relief vote on the eve of election.

No one will deny that this bill contains many provisions which have the approval of virtually the entire membership of this body, Republicans and Democrats alike. It clearly carries appropriations for many worth-while pursuits of the Federal Government. At each session of Congress we pass one, two, or perhaps three deficiency appropriation bills, and ordinarily a deficiency measure would be passed without much controversy.

POLITICAL TRICKERY

It is quite apparent that the administration recognizes that this pending bill contains provisions which all of us more or less enthusiastically endorse. However, the President and his advisors have seen to it that one of the most questionable appropriations we would be called upon to make is incorporated into and made a part of an otherwise acceptable measure. I think the attention of the country should be called to this political trickery.

As you read through this bill you finally come to these words:

To continue to provide relief and work relief on useful projects in the United States and its Territories and possessions by the Works Progress Administration, \$1,425,000,000, to remain available until June 30, 1937.

Is it not a fair question for me to ask why this appropriation to the Works Progress Administration of approximately \$1,500,000,000 was made a part of the first deficiency appropriation bill? Is it not a fair question for me to ask why this particular appropriation was not brought in here as a separate bill to be considered on its own merits?

One does not have to search long for the answer. It is because of the criticism which has been directed at the Works Progress Administration for waste and politics. It is because you do not wish to bring the W. P. A. squarely under the spotlight of public discussion. It is as if you thought that the President's request for one billion five hundred million could not stand by itself, but that, instead, you had to support it by including the appropriation in a group of other items.

It is political trickery, but you may be sure that the public understands this procedure. The country also understands the many other deceptive methods which have been employed by this administration in its utter disregard for the principles of our Government and its efforts to perpetuate its own existence.

ANOTHER BLANK-CHECK APPROPRIATION

Once again you are asking the Congress of the United States to make a blank-check appropriation, and once again I must raise my voice in opposition to this procedure. Approximately 1 year ago, when the four billion eight hundred and eighty million appropriation bill was before this body, I took occasion to call attention to the fact that we were not discharging our duty to the people we represent in appropriating such a vast sum of money without at least stipulating how it should be spent. The plea was without avail.

POLITICAL INTERESTS FURTHERED AT EXPENSE OF HUMAN SUFFERING

You made that blank-check appropriation, and you and I know that the money was literally wasted. You and I know that it has been used, at the expense of human suffering and want, to further political interests. It has been used to influence votes and to provide high-salaried administrative

positions for the building up of a Nation-wide political machine.

There are virtually no limitations as to how this money can be spent. From the language of this bill it appears that an attempt is made to have us believe that we are earmarking the funds. Ten general classes of projects are listed, and the only stipulation is the maximum amount which can be spent for each general class.

For example, it will be noted that there is that class of projects entitled "white-collar projects, \$90,000,000." Then there is "women's projects, \$90,000,000." Next comes "miscellaneous works projects, \$75,000,000." Who knows what type of projects such terminology covers? Moreover, I call attention to the fact that the bill does not provide that the stipulated amounts be spent for each class. That would be too binding for this administration. On the contrary, the bill merely states that the amount for each class shall not exceed the amount stipulated. In other words, nothing can be spent for a particular class of projects, or perhaps \$100.

I think every one of us realize, although, no doubt, the members of the majority will not admit it, that the language employed is simply a camouflage to meet the criticism that this is a blank-check appropriation. It is, indeed, unique, but certainly not clever enough to deceive the people of my district, who will be paying these bills with increased taxation.

THE PEOPLE WILL DEMAND AN ACCOUNTING

They will ask me what part of this one billion five hundred million will be allotted to the Resettlement Administration under Dr. Rexford Guy Tugwell. I will have to tell them frankly that their question cannot be answered. I shall have to tell them that the New Deal does not believe that the taxpayers should inquire as to how their money is spent. According to the New Dealers, that is not the true function of the taxpayer. His sole responsibility is to pay the bills, dream dreams, and not worry about the accumulation of debts.

TUGWELL'S UTOPIAN "DREAM VILLAGES" PATTERNED AFTER RUSSIA

When the question was asked of the Works Progress Administrator, Harry Hopkins, by the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations as to whether any of the funds would be used by the Resettlement Administration, he appeared to avoid a definite answer. He did say that \$90,000,000 would be under Resettlement. From the language of this bill there is every reason to believe that a much larger sum will be allocated to Dr. Tugwell to continue his utopian efforts after the pattern of Russia.

He is engaged in constructing "satellite towns", "dream villages", and brainstorm Russian homes. Some of these homes have been proposed for Lake County, which is in my district. As in the case of these projects for Lake County, upon examination of them you will find that there have been nothing but administrative delays after delays in carrying them out, all at the expense of the Government, and with hardship to the needy families who are supposed to be helped by the program.

TUGWELLIAN PHILOSOPHY DEMANDS GOVERNMENT CONTROL AND REGIMENTATION

I just recently completed reading the book written by Dr. Rexford G. Tugwell entitled "The Industrial Discipline and the Governmental Arts." No doubt many of you have read it; and, if so, I am sure you will agree with me that the whole philosophy advanced is that the Federal Government should assume control. He represents the American spokesman and actual practitioner of the communistic theory of government. We need not fear the May Day paraders and orators, but we have every cause to fear such men as Dr. Tugwell, one of the "brain trusters", who are in a position where they can put our people under communistic control and regimentation. I suggest that you read his books. While you are doing this, try to recall the measures enacted by the New Deal during the past 3 years. You will be startled at the number of them expressive of the Tugwellian philosophy of government.

There is no better illustration of the Tugwellian theory of regimentation and control than is found in the homestead

projects themselves. The homesteaders contract away their souls to the Resettlement Administration. I suggest that you get copies of the contracts used by Tugwell for the homesteaders and these community projects.

THE HOMESTEAD CONTRACTS ARE AN INSULT TO FREE AMERICANS

I have in my office what is known as the temporary licensing agreement. It is listed as form RA-MA 12, revised January 15, 1936, and approved by the Administrator. Get one and read it. You will find that the licensee contracts that he "shall not" and "shall not", but, rather, he will "comply", "observe", "adopt", and "adhere."

I would, for example, call your special attention to the fact that under item 4 of this license the licensee contracts that he will "adopt and adhere to any cropping program and tillage practice stipulated by the licensor."

There is one particular item in these contracts which will be of special interest to you as Members of Congress. It represents an insult to us as representatives of the people duly elected to serve them. It is item 6 in the temporary licensing agreement of form RA-MA 12 I just mentioned, and it is item 8 in the form used for the community projects.

I shall read this provision to you:

6. Noneligibility to benefits: No Member of or Delegate to Congress or Resident Commissioner shall be permitted to any share or part of this license or to any benefit that may arise thereupon.

There is not a Member sitting here today who would want any share in any of the benefits, but the fact that Dr. Tugwell will include such a provision in these contracts is an insult to the honesty and integrity of the Congress. I personally resent such a provision, and I know that you do also.

What do you imagine is the impression conveyed by Dr. Tugwell concerning Members of Congress through this provision of these contracts to the 500,000 or more people he calls "worthy and promising Resettlement clients"? He indirectly tells them in these contracts that their Representatives not only have nothing to do with the administration but, moreover, are not to be trusted. He thereby subtly plants the seeds of communism in the minds of the people whom we represent.

Thus even this bill is typically expressive of the Tugwellian communistic philosophy of government. The measure as it now reads leaves to a Congressman and his colleagues only the simple function of turning over to Dr. Tugwell and his colleagues this vast sum of money without restrictions.

THE RESETTLEMENT ADMINISTRATION UTTERLY ABANDONS TRUE PRINCIPLES OF OUR AMERICAN GOVERNMENT

Nothing I can say more clearly indicates the attitude of Dr. Tugwell toward the Congress of the United States, toward the Representatives of the people duly elected by them, than this insulting provision in these homestead contracts. And we have no assurance from the language of this bill before us that we are not appropriating money which will be ultimately given to him to continue his communistic endeavors, with utter abandon for the principles of government which every true American holds sacred.

SEVENTEEN THOUSAND AND FIFTY-FIVE RESETTLEMENT EMPLOYEES

When the Director of the Budget, Daniel W. Bell, was before the House Ways and Means Committee, he was called upon to submit information relative to the Resettlement Administration. The hearings show that the average number of people during this year on the pay roll of that Administration is 12,478. On April 1 of this year the Tugwell Resettlement had 17,055 employees.

The record of the hearings before the Ways and Means Committee on the Revenue Act of 1936 shows that from May 4, 1935, to March 23 of this year the sum of \$278,347,171.29 has been allocated to Dr. Tugwell's administration. The hearings also show (p. 705) that of this amount \$31,950,000 or more than 10 percent, has been for administrative expenses.

THE POLITICIANS' HAVEN

These employees are not selected according to the rules and regulations of the Civil Service Commission. They have not been chosen because of their executive efficiency and ability. You and I know that the Resettlement Administration, perhaps more than any other, has been the politicians'

haven. Party loyalty is the measure by which the employees are selected. It has been a place where Postmaster General James A. Farley, the campaign general of the New Deal, could place adherents to the New Deal on the public pay roll and thereby build up a vast political machine.

Mr. Chairman, I do not believe that there is one of us here who is not well aware of the need for relief for our people. I do not believe that there is one of us who is opposed to making appropriations which will afford the suffering people the necessary assistance. People who are without employment through no fault of their own should be given assistance until they have been able to find a permanent position.

MOST OF THIS APPROPRIATION WILL NEVER REACH THE NEEDY

But, Mr. Chairman, a great percentage of this money does not go to help the needy. The unemployed man receiving this assistance receives on the average \$50 per month; in some localities less and in others a little more. To employ one man for a year under the W. P. A. costs on the average of \$972, of which \$600 is for the year's wages of the self-respecting man. Three hundred and seventy-two dollars go for materials and supervision.

PITTSBURGH DEMOCRATIC OFFICIAL CITES WASTE

Let me read to you the statement made by the director of public works of the city of Pittsburgh, Leslie M. Johnston, before the Ways and Means Committee in connection with the tax bill recently passed by this House. He is a Democrat and cannot be said therefore to be talking simply for political purposes. He said:

I am here to tell you that 50 percent of that is sheer waste, and I know what I am talking about, because I have the handling of it * * *.

Later he explained that the "politicians of Pennsylvania" got the money supposed to be used to relieve human suffering in that city. He said:

As it is done now, you have a W. P. A. set-up in Pittsburgh consisting of hundreds of men at high salaries. You have another W. P. A. set-up in Harrisburg of hundreds of men with high salaries. You have Mr. Hopkins' set-up in Washington with thousands of men at high salaries. We say that is absolutely and totally unnecessary * * *. I am telling you quite firmly that 50 percent of that money is absolute sheer waste, and I can prove that statement. That is not a wild statement.

Those are the words of one of the Democratic officials of the great city of Pittsburgh. Those are the words of a man who is familiar with construction projects. He is the city's director of public works.

GENERAL HAGOOD ASSAILS W. P. A. "STAGE" MONEY

Everyone who has been associated with the relief program, as conducted by this administration, who has the courage to state fully and frankly his opinion of it has emphatically stated that the money is wasted. I just remind you that Maj. Gen. Johnson Hagood dared to appear before the Committee on Appropriations and say what he thought of the use of funds by the W. P. A. He called it "stage money, because you can pass it around but you cannot get anything out of it in the end." I quote from his testimony:

As to relief funds and other funds, I am not familiar with the various pockets in which Uncle Sam keeps his money. I understand that there is Budget money, which is very hard to get; there is P. W. A. money, which is not so hard to get; and then there is a vast quantity of W. P. A. money, which is very easy to get for trifling projects but almost impossible to get for anything worth while.

Neither Director of Public Works Leslie M. Johnston, of the city of Pittsburgh, nor Maj. Gen. Johnson Hagood, who had been in the service of the United States Army for over 20 years, had any reason to make the statements they did except that they wished this Congress to know the truth. As a matter of fact, because he told the truth, Major General Hagood was relieved of his command. It was only because this administration could not stand the adverse public reaction to his dismissal without just cause that he was sent to serve as commander of the Sixth Corps Area. It vindicated him personally.

Major General Hagood is a man of convictions. He has since resigned and returned to private life. He has done

what so many others have done who became a part of this administration but found that it was following a program which would ultimately lead us to chaos.

This appropriation may read "to provide relief", but the unemployed know and the taxpayers know that if we were to be accurate we would change that language to read, "to provide funds for political patronage and for the purpose of influencing elections."

SOUTHERN STATES CONTRIBUTE PRACTICALLY NOTHING TO RELIEF

If you examine the figures for the distribution of funds according to States, it will be clearly seen that some of the States have provided a large percentage of the money for relief purposes but other States have contributed practically nothing. The figures show that my home State of Illinois has given 24.8 percent of the funds used in that State from January to September 1935. Fifteen States, on the other hand, have contributed 10 percent or less. They are West Virginia, Virginia, South Dakota, Nevada, Wyoming, Tennessee, Alabama, Georgia, Florida, Arkansas, North Carolina, New Mexico, Louisiana, Mississippi, and South Carolina. We in Illinois are not only helping to take care of our own needy but as a large tax-paying State we are contributing to the care of the needy in the Democratic States of the South and West.

It is not that we do not feel that we are all a part of one great country, and it is not that we are not willing to contribute for the help of other parts of the country. But we wish to be treated fairly. We demand that other States likewise be compelled to make some effort for the proper care of their needy, and I am supporting an amendment which will be later offered to that end.

THE RELIEF ADMINISTRATION IS ROTTED BY POLITICAL THIEVERY

Politics play a part in the distribution of funds to the States. Politics play a part in the selection of projects. Politics play a part in the selection of the administrative personnel and there are innumerable instances during this administration where political capital has been made of human misery and suffering. Time and again the newspapers of Illinois have pointed out where attempts have been made to influence the votes of those who have the misfortune to have to depend on relief work for their bread and butter. When any administration, whether it is Republican or Democratic, makes political capital of human misery and suffering, I say to you that it is contemptible.

THE "HYPOCRATS" CAPITALIZE ON HUMAN SUFFERING

I say to you that this bill with no congressional restrictions, unless amended, further entrenches the existing dictatorship. It enables the present administration, from the date of its passage until the election in November, to dangle before the voters on relief and sponsors of projects an inviting bait secured from the already overburdened taxpayer. Capitalizing on human hardship is the program of those in power who, because of such practices, will be known in history as the "hypocrats." They surely cannot be Democrats as we have known them.

RELIEF SHOULD BE ADMINISTERED BY LOCAL NONPARTISAN BOARDS

Mr. Chairman, I believe in adequate appropriations to take care of our needy, but I demand that this use of relief for political purposes stop. I demand that we stop this wasteful expenditure of money for useless projects and for providing high-salaried jobs. This can be accomplished if the Federal Government would turn the administration of relief funds over to nonpartisan boards selected by the Governors of the individual States, whose duty it would be to see that the money is spent for worth-while projects and that it is used solely to help the needy rather than to help any one political party carry an election. There is absolutely no necessity for these high administrative costs simply to provide political jobs at the expense of the unemployed and at the expense of an already overtaxed public.

It is our obligation as Representatives to see that a program is devised whereby the unemployed may be taken care of until they are absorbed by private enterprise. The most economical and most effective way of handling this problem

is to permit each individual State, in cooperation with the local communities, to devise its own particular program. Each section of the country has its own needs and its own problems to be met. They are better equipped to determine what should be the nature of a program for meeting their peculiar circumstances and conditions than any administration here in Washington. Let them develop such a program of work relief, designed to afford employment and at the same time to carry out projects of a permanent and lasting value.

DISMISS THE THOUSANDS OF BUREAUCRATS

What valid objection can be made to the proposal that the administration of these funds be made by a nonpartisan board in each State, appointed by its Governor, with the Federal Government simply lending its cooperation by way of financial assistance. I would discharge the thousands and thousands of Federal employees here in Washington and scattered throughout the United States. I would dismiss thousands of these bureaucrats. They serve no useful purpose. They are merely a duplication of already existing administrative agencies in various States and communities which have had experience with many different kinds of projects.

At the last session of Congress you refused to assume this responsibility. You simply appropriated four billion eight hundred and eighty million, with an abandon disturbing to every citizen, and vested in the President and his appointees full authority to spend it as they saw fit. Today they are asking us to give them another one billion five hundred million.

REAL PERMANENT RELIEF WILL COME ONLY THROUGH REVIVAL OF BUSINESS

In considering this problem of unemployment, let us not lose sight of the fact that while we have spent these billions in a so-called "prime the pump" effort, there are still approximately 11,000,000 people unemployed in the United States. This is about the same number of unemployed as when the New Deal came into power. At its best a public-works or work-relief program can only be a temporary expedient. Our real problem is to pursue a constructive course of action to revive business so that these unemployed may find places in private enterprise. No self-respecting American wishes to spend his life on work-relief projects. Our people want permanent jobs. They want the opportunity to make their contribution to the development of this great country, to be able to provide more than mere subsistence for their families.

INCREASING FEDERAL DEFICIT

This administration has been in power for over 3 years. It has had full control of both Houses of Congress, and every imaginable power has been given the President of the United States, making him a virtual dictator. Yet the unemployment and relief problem still remains. As a result of it all, we have nothing more than a public debt of approximately thirty-two billion, and if we add to this Federal guaranties and other obligations it amounts to a debt of almost thirty-nine billion, which will take generations to pay.

How are we paying off this public debt? We are not even attempting to, but on the contrary, for the present fiscal year to date we have been running behind in the amount of two billion six hundred and eighty-five million.

As I stated in one of my speeches at the last session of Congress in opposition to the Guffey coal bill, which the President asked us to pass regardless of its constitutionality, the choice which the people now have to make is between the New Deal and their birthright of a free democratic government. It is a choice between a birthright and a mess of pottage, a choice between "life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness" and political dictation from Washington. It is a choice between returning to the principles of government which have evolved throughout the years and which have proved sufficiently flexible to meet any emergency, or a continuation of New Deal experimentation with confusion, debts, taxes, inflation, and pernicious denial of personal liberties which we cherish.

Mr. Chairman, it will take more than the six billion three hundred and eighty million appropriated during the last 2 years solely for so-called relief purposes to compel our people to give up their birthright for a continuation of the New Deal program. I am firmly convinced that our country is awakened to the fact that the fundamental premise upon which this Government was established is that the "Government is the agent of the people" and not, according to the apparent New Deal philosophy, that the people are the agents of the Government. Our people have been taught, and rightly so, that their Government is to serve them. They are not to be made servants of it.

NEED FOR CONFIDENCE

How is it possible for business to revive and for those on relief to find positions in private enterprise when confidence is lacking? As I stated before on the floor of this House, so long as this New Deal experimentation exists there cannot be a revival in business. Simply stated, the program, with its undefined objectives as indicated by this bill, unless amended, and wasteful expenditures, has tended to destroy rather than foster confidence, which is the basis of our economic activity.

Futurity and confidence are distinctive factors of business. One does not borrow unless he is confident he can repay. One does not buy unless he is confident he can pay for his purchases, nor does one sell unless he has confidence in the buyer's capacity to pay. One does not invest unless he is confident of a return on his investment.

When the element of confidence is missing, trade reaches low levels. We lack confidence to buy, to sell, to borrow, to loan, or to invest. Under the New Deal we cannot be certain as to the future and, more specifically, we cannot be certain as to future values.

Our people want to work and not subsist year in and year out on the relief rolls. By no magic is it possible to have employees without employers, and let us not lose sight of the fact that when we make blank-check appropriations like this, when we allow this waste to continue, and when people are forced to become mere political puppets because of their misfortune, we destroy every bit of confidence in the future. No one knows what to expect. Business remains still. Unemployment continues and the relief problem remains with us. The problem will remain as long as these "hypocrites" continue in power. [Applause.]

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, referring to some remarks made by the eloquent gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] about the arguments being put up on this side of the House for the administration, I want to observe that the enormous vote that is being rolled up for President Roosevelt in big Republican States, exceeding the sum of the votes for all other slates and candidates, would indicate that the arguments being made on this side of the House are, if not wasted, at least not necessary.

It reminds me of a noted murder case that I participated in, in which a battery of us lawyers, after arguing to the jury for 4 days for an acquittal, found out that the jurors had held a meeting in advance of the arguments and had unanimously come to the conclusion that the defendants were not guilty. [Laughter.]

But I did not rise for this purpose. Yesterday two gentlemen, one on either side of the aisle, sharply criticized and condemned the Works Progress Administration for squandering money in a way which they said actually demoralized the recipients, and they offered as proof the horrible example, work going on on First Street, east of the Capitol Plaza, and in front of the Supreme Court Building and the Library of Congress, where they said there was a large number of men loafing on the job and sleeping on their shovels. The gentlemen urged us not to take their word but to go and see for ourselves.

I had occasion to pass that way this morning, and I not only looked but inquired, and I found that by far the greater

part of this work that was going on is the laying of a new streetcar track by the Rapid Transit Co., the street railway company of this city. There were a large number of men on this work. I know both by experience and observation that when men work for a private corporation they do not soldier on the job.

Now, the other work is two small sewer connections that the District of Columbia is putting in, on which the W. P. A. is paying two-thirds and the District one-third of the cost. Only about 20 men were engaged on these jobs, and they were working. This is usually the result when you take up and investigate these complaints, you find that generally the most of it is without foundation. But in this case I am going to follow the example of the critics and advise that you gentlemen go over and see for yourselves what is going on in front of the Capitol Grounds and see whether you can corroborate what I say and find out where the truth lies. You may get an object lesson in the difference between looking and seeing.

I shall insert at this point the colloquy between the two gentlemen who so sweepingly condemn W. P. A. and all its works and who cite in support of their indictment what they think they saw. It is taken from the RECORD of May 7, page 6849.

While I am on this subject I may say that I have found in the RECORD a statement by the gentleman who furnished the bulk of the above misinformation that a public golf course, accomplished as a W. P. A. project in my home city, is located on the city dumping ground. Since I live adjacent to this golf course, my word may be taken for the fact that it is located on the level prairie commanding beautiful mountain ranges, including famous Pikes Peak, all of which region I have the honor to represent. I find this a most opportune time to correct the statement of the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that the Works Progress Administration is doing an enormous task creditably, and that a whole lot of this so-called boondoggling is the only possible way in which you can reach all elements of our population.

Artisans and artists must live, as well as common laborers, and they should be employed in a way that will preserve touch with their skill and their artistry. I was struck recently by an article devoted to showing that great numbers of skilled workmen had lost their touch and fitness through long unemployment at their particular callings, and arguing that such men could not be rehabilitated by pick and shovel work and might become permanently disqualified for their former work even if opportunity offered. It is the same with musicians, painters, writers, actors, and many of the so-called white-collar professions and vocations. A rounded works program calls for a proportionate recognition of all classes of workers, and W. P. A. is undertaking to do this. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Colorado has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MAAS].

Mr. MAAS. Mr. Chairman, I think the position of the Republicans is quite clear, that we stand for relief. We do not propose to permit people to starve nor even to be hungry in this country, but we do take the attitude that the administration of relief should be divorced from partisan political control. I understand perfectly that under the doctrine of "to the victor belongs the spoils", the party in power has a perfect right to spend these funds, but when you insist that the money must be expended by a man who is in no sense a responsible constitutional official, a man who has never been voted for by the people, or even by the Senate in confirmation, then you subject yourselves to the very strong suspicion of a desire mainly for political control. We feel that this money should be paid in direct grants to the States, and that the States should be permitted to administer the funds, and I dare to say if you will make your allocations on that basis, we will take care of twice as many people in this country in saving them from want and destitution. People on the Democratic side are wont to prate about Jefferson and

take his name so frequently in vain, extolling the virtues of his philosophy of decentralized government, yet, in practice, you indulge in policies which would make even the despised Hamilton repudiate you. We want relief, but we want the money to go to people who need it, not to those who administer it. Why do you insist on a great Federal set-up to administer this relief unless it is to make political capital from the sufferings of the people? The simple, plain, economical American way to handle relief would be for the Federal Government to make its contributions direct to the States, and then let the States, in their own sovereign power, administer the funds along with their own relief appropriations. We would have in that way a more economical administration, and more people would be taken care of, and you would not then be subjected to the very logical criticism that your main interest is political control and political power. If your interest is not partisanship and for the political advantage you can get in elections by the direct handling of relief funds through your extra-legal political bureaus, why do you insist, against all of your highly expressed principles, in setting up this great Federal bureaucracy?

Just why is there need to have this gigantic network of Federal bureaucrats to distribute relief to the needy? In every State there are already adequate State-wide and local agencies to administer relief. Why is it necessary to overlap and duplicate these local agencies by a Federal domination unless there is an ulterior purpose? Certainly the present system of being overrun by hordes of petty Federal bureaucrats has not resulted in a more economical use of relief funds. Certainly these Federal agencies are no more competent to direct relief activities than the local officials; in fact, it is obvious that they cannot know local needs nearly so well as the local officials.

Certainly there is no ordinary explanation of this new Democratic Party policy of Federal superstate governments. No; the explanation has nothing to do with relief of ameliorating sufferings of the people. The old Democratic solution would have been the plain, simple, direct method of making money grants to the several States as the Federal Government's contribution to this problem. What we are witnessing is a crude, brutal attempt to capitalize the tragedy of a depression to set up an iron-handed political machine aimed at perpetuation in office by a combination of public bribery through the use of Federal funds and the ruthless strangling of any and all opposition by the way the funds are distributed which amounts to nothing less than official blackmail.

I call upon the party of State rights to put their principles into practice and return local control to the States and local units.

There is no better place to start than upon the administration of relief funds.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, it is impossible for me to present my views on relief in 4 minutes. However, I take this opportunity to point out certain salient features, and they are these: First of all, we still have over 12,000,000 unemployed. Despite the so-called recovery in finance, despite the so-called recovery in production, we still have over 12,000,000 unemployed. Last year when we appropriated \$4,800,000,000 we were dealing with 12,000,000 unemployed. We found that amount inadequate. This year, for the same problem, to deal with the same condition, we are appropriating only \$1,425,000,000. This, to my mind, constitutes a serious retreat on the part of the administration before the reactionaries who are expressing the view that relief appropriations should be cut down. The only courageous policy to be followed at this time is to increase this

appropriation, so as to provide adequate funds in order to maintain the unemployed in a state of health and decency.

Instead we find that the beat, beat, beat of retreat on the part of the administration is being reechoed in the empty stomachs of the unemployed. Seven hundred thousand men are being removed from W. P. A. and more will have been discharged by June 30 of this year. What is going to happen to those 700,000 men? Are you going to have them depend on private industry? Are you going to throw these 700,000 unemployed on the mercies of the so-called private industry? Are you going to throw them on the mercies of substandard wages or are you going to be courageous enough to stand up in front of the reactionaries and adopt a realistic and sane policy of adequate appropriation for the unemployed? I know that it may be expedient to compromise in the face of the onslaughts of the chambers of commerce and other representatives of entrenched wealth—I know that it may be politically wise to do so, but at the same time you are doing so at the expense of the unemployed. Not only do you discharge 700,000 men, but you refuse to take on those who have become in need after November 1935, and in December 1935 you discontinued funds for direct relief, so that today there are no Federal funds available or being used for Federal direct relief, and the result is that millions of men, women, and children in the richest country in the world are today living on starvation budgets, actually slowly starving to death. On the one hand you propose a most inadequate appropriation of \$1,425,000,000, on the other hand we hear the demand that we cut down these appropriations. Mr. Chairman, I say that we must face the people realistically. We must increase the appropriation so as to care for all of the unemployed. Let me say that you cannot afford to crucify the unemployed on the cross of political expediency.

You cannot afford to compromise with the chambers of commerce and the Liberty League. You started in the right direction. Finish the job. Do not retreat. The unemployed of this Nation are looking to you for adequate appropriations to give the unemployed of this Nation a decent living during their period of unemployment. Reactionaries attack the unemployed because they ask for relief. Why should they not ask for relief? Why are they not entitled to relief? Is it the fault of the unemployed that they are unemployed? The unemployed of America want work; they do not want relief. If they do not get any work, it is not their fault. Therefore, it is our primary responsibility to provide for them. Why punish them, since their unemployment is due to no fault of theirs? It is the fault of an economic system which permits want in a land of plenty. Such an economic system must be overhauled and eventually will be overhauled by the American people themselves, through their Representatives in Congress.

In conclusion, I make this appeal to both sides of the aisle. Remember, you must face the unemployed in November. Remember, they are appealing to you today. They will appeal to you tomorrow and they will continue their appeal. Increase these appropriations and do not decrease them. Appropriate sufficiently for the unemployed of these United States. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MITCHELL].

Mr. MITCHELL of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, at this point I desire to extend my own remarks on the Tennessee Valley Authority.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MITCHELL of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, the people of my State and of my congressional district are very greatly and vitally interested in the appropriation carried in this bill for the Tennessee Valley Authority for the coming fiscal year of 1937. The sum of \$41,117,816 is available in this bill for flood control and navigation at Wilson Dam and Reservoir, Norris Dam and Reservoir, Wheeler Dam, Pickwick Landing Dam, Hiwassee, Guntersville, and McReynolds Dams. All these projects are worthy and will be most helpful in flood

control and navigation. Funds are made available also for surveys and investigations for other main river dams and tributaries to the amount of \$32,000,000.

For the electricity program over \$5,000,000 is appropriated. For fertilizer and agricultural development, \$4,484,000. All these items are meritorious. I regret to see that the Budget estimate of \$43,000,000 for the T. V. A. has been reduced to \$39,900,000.

The development of the Tennessee River has been of inestimable value to the people of our State. Cheaper electricity is now made possible to all the people. The "yardstick" is working. New electric lines are being constructed in many counties in my congressional district in middle Tennessee to take advantage of the T. V. A. rate. Farm homes are for the first time being furnished with electric current in many sections of my district. This wonderful convenience and benefaction has created new interest in farm values and farm life and given an impetus to the movement of "back to the farm." This is important in the development of the resources of our people and of our common country. The young people will no longer move to the towns and cities to have the convenience of the white light. They will find this now available on the farm in many sections of middle Tennessee where it was not before possible to have it. This convenience has come as a result of the New Deal.

I recently introduced a bill in the House to so amend the T. V. A. Act as to include the Cumberland River and its tributaries within the provisions of said T. V. A. Act, and thus make possible the development of the Cumberland and Caney Fork Rivers. This amendment should and, I hope, will be soon favorably recommended for passage by the Military Affairs Committee of the House. It has been passed by the Senate. The bill was introduced by Senator LOGAN, of Kentucky. I have assurance that the proposed amendment will be given a full and careful hearing at the next session of Congress, when and after the present development at Muscle Shoals and Norris have been more nearly completed, and when figures can then be had upon the earning power of the present projects.

I wish it were possible to have my amendment adopted at this session of Congress, so that the present appropriation bill might provide sufficient funds for the development of the Cumberland River Valley, and so that work might begin on the Cumberland and Caney Fork Rivers, and thus make possible a development in middle Tennessee similar to the ones now going on in east Tennessee. But I realize that it takes time for projects of this great magnitude to be developed. Rome was not built in a day. Neither will the present generation witness a full development of the potential power sites in our country, but no finer opportunities are afforded for the erection of power dams than those afforded in the Cumberland River Valley and the valleys of the Caney Fork. These two great rivers traverse some of the finest farming lands in the United States. All that the people now need in these sections to bring about an unprecedented era of prosperity and improvement is to be afforded cheaper electricity and the opportunities which follow its development. I do not doubt but that the forward steps being taken by this Congress will be adopted and followed by the next. The people will not be denied the right to the use of the rivers, which are the common property of all the people. They will utilize them. It only requires time for sentiment to crystallize and the people to become aroused to the fact that they have in the past been too long profited upon by the utilities and power companies.

These companies have sinned away their day of grace. They have enjoyed protection all too long through paid lobbyists who have represented them in the legislative halls. They must now see the handwriting on the wall. If not, it is because they are blind to their own surroundings. Unless they adjust and lower their rates and charges for electric current they will be faced by an aroused public, and their days are, and should be, numbered. Some have already realized the necessity for cheaper rates and have lowered them. There is ample room for still greater reductions. It

was only after the T. V. A. was a reality and on the scene in my State that any reduction in electric charges was made. The rural communities were ignored altogether so far as electric service was concerned until the building of the T. V. A. lines. More power to this great Government agency! It is a benefaction to all the people. It has made truly a new empire in the section where its activities have been greatest.

No one dares dispute the record of achievement. The public has suffered long and has been most tolerant. All agree that the Tennessee Valley Authority has added untold millions in material wealth to the sections where they are operating. The values added to the convenience, health, and happiness of our people cannot be estimated in dollars and cents. The reduced rates on electricity alone to the people of Tennessee will equal the amount expended on the T. V. A. development. Cheaper fertilizers will also be made available to our farmers. The improvement in the soil and the added blessings coming cannot be appraised.

Let us continue in this new field of endeavor. Let us develop all sections of our common country. Let us no longer neglect the South, but give it an equal opportunity with the rest of America. We have suffered in the past materially because of discriminations in tariff schedules and lack of sufficient appropriations to develop our natural resources. Let us use the talents given us by a kindly Providence and make and build a greater Tennessee and a greater America.

I hope my colleagues in the House will cooperate and help to pass at the next session of Congress the bill for the development of the Cumberland River Valley Authority. The passage of this measure will afford as great, if not greater, possibilities for the people than the development in which we are all so greatly interested now going on at Norris in east Tennessee. Middle Tennessee is more thickly populated and has a more productive soil than does east Tennessee, taken as a whole. Let us continue in this good work. Let no backward steps be taken, no retreat sounded, but ever a victorious march to build a better and more fit place in which to live, not only for the present but for all future generations.

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHANLEY].

Mr. SHANLEY. Mr. Chairman, for 25 years the British Empire has been attempting to solve the unemployment problem, and yet it has not yet obtained the answer. Our struggle with this all-pervading perplexity has just begun. Before we take the next step let us ponder carefully and dispassionately the previous efforts. We need more than strong adjectives and invectives to solve this twentieth century gordian knot. For the information of the House I ask unanimous consent to extend and revise my remarks and include therein some thoughts on the problem as handled by the British.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN].

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, I think those in charge of this business of relief in Washington have done a good job and many of those who are criticizing are just a little sore because they are not doing the job themselves.

It makes a great deal of difference in the minds of some people who or what party is doing a job as to whether it is good or bad. Harry Hopkins and those who have labored with him have had a stupendous task. Regardless of all criticism that has been leveled at him and his organization, I think he has done a splendid job in the administration of the duties committed to him. His administration with the money that Congress has appropriated has brought food, raiment, and shelter to numberless people who would have gone hungry and been destitute of practically every necessity of life. Not only in the feeding and clothing of the hungry has the Works Progress Administration served the country but in the one item of building thousands of miles of farm-to-market roads it has in a great part justified its existence.

This program has lifted thousands of farmers out of the mud and put them on all-weather roads so that they can market their produce at all seasons of the year and, added to that, make farm life easier and more pleasant.

Out of funds already appropriated, more than a half billion dollars has been set aside for roads. I, therefore, take great pleasure in supporting this bill to carry on these and other objectives that are being attained under this administration. Not only in these things but in others that I will mention has the administration of President Roosevelt reached out and touched and helped the plain citizen and the heretofore forgotten man.

The agricultural program of this administration has, in my opinion, done more for agriculture than all other administrations heretofore piled into one. When I speak of the agricultural program I cannot but mention my friend and colleague, MARVIN JONES, chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, who from his position was the proper man to sponsor agricultural legislation, and to say that it has been a pleasure as well as a privilege to me to follow him and support him in all of his measures to bring about a betterment of agricultural conditions throughout the length and breadth of the land. We have but to look at the plight of agriculture on March 1, 1933, and the prices received then and the prices received now by the farmer to see at a glance what this program has meant to the farmers. Take a few examples; cotton, for instance, on March 1, 1933, was selling at an average of 5.90 cents per pound and on January 1, 1936, at 11.35 cents per pound, an advance of 92 percent; wheat, on March 1, 1933, 48 cents per bushel, on January 1, 1936, 101½ cents per bushel, an advance of 111 percent; corn was on March 1, 1933, 24.12 cents per bushel, on January 1, 1936, 60.87 cents per bushel, an advance of 152 percent. Dairy products, cattle, and hogs have had a similar increase. The average for sweetpotatoes in 1932 was 40 cents per bushel and in 1935 65 cents per bushel; hogs in 1932 selling for 3.40 cents per pound and in 1935, 7.30 cents per pound; beef cattle in 1932, 3.30 cents per pound and in 1935, 5 cents per pound; sheep in 1932, 2.35 cents per pound and in 1935, 4 cents per pound; chickens in 1932, 9 cents per pound, and in 1935, 13 cents per pound; butter from the farm in 1932, 19 cents per pound, and in 1935, 27 cents per pound.

Take the country as a whole, the yearly average prices of all groups of farm products increased 66 percent from 1932 to 1935. Take the State of Texas alone, and see what the figures are. Cash receipts from the sale of principal farm products in Texas in 1932 were \$280,713,000, and in 1935 these same crops sold for \$442,310,000, including \$68,527,000 in rental and benefit payments. This is an increase of approximately 58 percent. It took some of our city friends a long time to become convinced that the problem of the farmer was their problem also. When the bottom fell out of farm prices in 1930, 1931, and 1932, factories began to close, unemployment increased in every city and town in the United States, for the simple reason that the farmers had no buying power. It has been my contention for years, and is now, that if you give the 35,000,000 people on the farms of America a buying power every portion of the country will be reasonably prosperous and labor will be employed, factories will be opened, business will be sound, and banks will be safe. The great hope, therefore, for the country is for agriculture, through those engaged in agriculture, to make the cost of production and have a surplus with which to buy the things that they need. To retain these vast benefits, not only for agriculture but for every enterprise and every business in the land, the fight must be kept up and the administration headed by President Roosevelt and backed by a Congress that will support him should be continued in office to see that the gains that we have made are not lost, but that further gains are made until we have a country in which to live in which there is fair play and justice meted out to all sections and to all classes. When the impartial history of these times is written and the writers become sane and not partisan, President Roosevelt will stand forth as the outstanding, forward-looking, wise statesman of the age.

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, I hope that all have now made our speeches against the bill and that we will get busy and help pass the bill. I want to ask my brethren on the other side of the aisle and my colleagues on this side of the aisle to be as indulgent with the committee as possible in order that we may be about our business and perhaps be this afternoon able to go over until Monday.

I ask that the Clerk read the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

All time has expired. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1936, and prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1936, and June 30, 1937, and for other purposes, namely:

Mr. McLEAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. McLEAN: On page 2, line 1, after the word "years", strike out the remainder of the paragraph.

Mr. McLEAN. Mr. Chairman, it is my policy to look with favor on all bills for carrying on the activities of the Government reported by the Committee on Appropriations. The committee is composed of men who have been so long in service as Members of the House that they have become experts in governmental affairs and are so familiar with the needs of the Government that the probable appropriations can be anticipated far in advance, and their judgment can be relied upon to such an extent that under ordinary circumstances with a limited amount of study it is possible to support their recommendations.

The pending bill is an exception to this rule. It carries appropriations amounting to \$2,363,601,165.11. This amount is distributed over a number of propositions, any one of which is worthy of separate legislation and independent consideration, but all being included in the one measure makes it impossible to discriminate, and a Member must vote for all or none. In such a situation one must decide whether the items he approves are sufficient to justify disregard of items of which he disapproves. The item of \$1,425,000,000 proposed for the Works Progress Administration and \$246,000,000 for emergency conservation work are of so much importance and involve principles of such magnitude that they ought not to be tied into this bill, and should be separately considered on their own merits. Likewise, the items, amounting to \$187,800,000 and \$270,831,960, or a total of \$458,631,860, for financing the social-security program involve principles entirely different from the above, and are of so much importance that they, too, should have separate consideration and a separate vote on their merits. Those items which are essentially for deficiencies necessary to be appropriated to meet requirements of the Government departments are all that should be included in this bill.

If one approves of the so-called relief items and disapproves of the construction and alteration of public buildings in the District of Columbia or the appropriation for the T. V. A., he must forego his objections in favor of the public-works appropriation. As the situation now stands, all other items in the bill will have to be subordinated to the importance of the appropriation for the public-works programs. Like the debris of a tornado, they will be carried along in the vortex of the big wind, which will blow \$1,450,000,000 into departmental control without limitation or restriction.

What I have said is also true of the appropriation for the Tennessee Valley Authority. This is not a deficiency appropriation. It is the appropriation for their activities for the year 1937. The principle upon which this appropriation is based is far different from that of the social-security legislation or the appropriations for public works. To involve all of these matters may easily lead to confusion and hasty consideration, which is bound to result in waste and unnecessary expenditures.

In order to vote for this measure one should be satisfied with the wisdom and sufficiency of all of its items. The

report of the committee in explanation of the items covers 52 closely printed pages. The hearings constitute two volumes—part 1 covering 1,408 pages, and part 2, pertaining entirely to emergency relief works of the P. W. A., covering 495 pages. The bill itself covers 99 pages, and an intelligent understanding requires reference to many other documents, and we are expected to attend faithfully the sessions of the House. None of the data was made available to Members until 12 o'clock yesterday, and we are asked to vote intelligently on the measure before the close of today, giving slightly more than 48 hours to study and understand what we are doing.

There is also another consideration that makes it difficult, and it is not going too far to say impossible, to vote intelligently on this measure. This ordinary appropriation bill disregards the fact that many of the appropriations are not to carry out projects authorized by Congress, and which have had the consideration of legislative committees, but the bill itself authorizes the project for which the appropriation is made. This practice is unfair to other committees of the House. When the Committee on Appropriations, in addition to the duties for which it was constituted, takes it upon itself to frame legislation which establishes policies, creates agencies, and confers powers, the legislative committees of the House are deprived of the functions which they were created to perform.

The committee by its report admits the irregularity of this procedure. As a preface to explaining 25 legislative items it states as follows:

The legislative provisions not heretofore enacted in connection with any other appropriation bill are recommended.

To make the matter more difficult the hearings before the Committee on Appropriations are held behind closed doors, and Members of the House were unwelcome guests. There is no reason why the situation concerning this bill should exist. Many of the items have been ready for presentation to the House for several days while we have been waiting for this bill to be presented, and much time has expired during which such items could have had mature deliberation. Instead, they were held in committee to be tacked onto this important measure and carried through by the momentum of the importance of the larger items.

There are many items in this bill of which I approve. There are others of which I very strongly disapprove. There is ample time to divide the several matters and they should be divided to give to each the consideration it deserves.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

For services in compiling, arranging for the printer, reading proof, indexing testimony, stenography and typewriting, supervision of the work, and expenses incurred in the contested-election cases of the Seventy-fourth Congress, as authorized by the act entitled "An act relating to contested elections", approved March 2, 1887 (U. S. C., title 2, secs. 201-226), \$750.

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, when we reach page 22 of this bill I will offer the following amendment:

On page 22 strike out lines 9 to 17, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"The rates of pay for persons engaged upon any project under the foregoing appropriation shall be not less than the prevailing rates of pay for work of a similar nature as determined by the Works Progress Administration, and in the employment of such persons upon such projects, preference shall be given to unemployed citizens of the United States listed by the United States Employment Service, or any agency designated by it, and residing in the community within which such project is carried on."

I simply wanted to call this to the attention of the House at this time so that the Members will know what that amendment is when we reach page 22.

I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the pro-forma amendment.

The pro-forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION COMMISSION

Employees' Compensation Fund, Emergency Relief: For administrative expenses and the payment of compensation in connection with the administration of the benefits authorized by section 2 of the act entitled "Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1935", approved April 8, 1935 (49 Stat. 115-119), \$6,000,000 of the special fund set up on the books of the Treasury pursuant to the provisions of the said act shall be available for expenditure during the fiscal year 1937.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky: Page 5, line 8, strike out the word "emergency" and the word "work."

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. We have passed that paragraph long ago. The Clerk is reading now on page 7 of the bill.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. It is in the same paragraph.

Mr. WOODRUM. The gentleman said page 5.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Page 6. We are now on page 7 of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Virginia press the point of order?

Mr. WOODRUM. I am compelled to do it, Mr. Chairman, if we ever intend to get through with this bill.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, it is in that same paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. McCORMACK). The Chair is ready to rule. The paragraph to which the gentleman has offered the amendment has been read and passed. For that reason the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FISH: Page 6, line 18, after the word "fund", strike out the words "Emergency Relief."

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I am not, of course, in the confidence of the Democratic Members of the House. I do not know whether they propose to try to earmark the appropriations or some of them and place them under the Public Works Administration. If they propose to do so, or if any single member on the Democratic side proposes to offer an amendment, there is at least one vote on the Republican side that can be counted on. With me it is merely a matter of principle. I am opposed to granting large sums of money to the President, whether he be a Republican or a Democrat, or to any individual. I believe it is a betrayal of our representative and constitutional form of government. I believe the control of the purse strings to be the main reason for the existence of Congress, and that when the Members of Congress, in defiance of the Constitution and practically of their oath of office, surrender the control of the purse strings, they are betraying their own legislative powers. Already there are rumors in the country that the House of Representatives should be abolished.

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the gentleman from New York is not addressing himself to his pro-forma amendment. We have been liberal in debate and have not confined it to the bill, as the original agreement limiting debate contemplated; and I do not think gentlemen on either side of the aisle should undertake to make partisan political speeches at this time, and if I can stop it I am going to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule.

The section under consideration relates to the Employees' Compensation Commission.

The gentleman from New York will proceed in order.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I have said about all I wanted to say on the subject, and my views in reference to it are fairly well known. I doubt if I could change the minds of many Members of Congress anyway.

I want to vote for the bill; I want to vote for emergency relief; I want to vote for the Social Security Act and the

compensation provided in this paragraph; but it is very difficult for me to vote for it when it involves a departure from a definite fundamental principle of government.

So far as emergency relief is concerned, I have just come back from the State of West Virginia, where I spoke last night and the night before. That State, due to relief money, may very likely go Democratic. [Applause.] Politics is the whole purpose of this bill. The bill makes a political football of relief and plays politics with human misery.

A distinguished Democratic Senator not making this statement in the Senate but in the State of West Virginia rocked that State by saying that this emergency relief, W. P. A. Administration, was nothing but a political machine, that the money was corruptly spent and thrown away. It was not a Republican speaking, it was a Democratic Senator elected by the Democratic voters of the State of West Virginia who made this bitter attack on the waste and misuse of public funds for relief purposes in his own State.

There is an additional reason I am opposed to this program. I believe also that you are creating a gigantic political machine at the expense of the taxpayers' money under guise of relief. This ought to be sufficient reason for most of us to vote against it. Mr. Chairman, I hope some Democratic Member will offer an amendment to earmark the funds for the Public Works Administration. He will have considerable support on our side. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS

For an additional amount for scientific research, special investigations, and technical reports in the field of aeronautics, including the same objects specified under this head in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1936, \$1,367,000, to continue available until June 30, 1937, of which amount there may be expended not to exceed \$1,100,000 for the construction and equipment of an additional wind tunnel, and not to exceed \$267,000 for increasing the length of the present seaplane model testing tank and providing necessary additional equipment therefor.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Chairman, a particular responsibility, in connection with the relief of the unemployed, rests upon the Federal Government where governmental action has directly contributed to aggravating the problem. In such an instance Congress is not permitted to shield itself behind generalities and commonly accepted principles. Where unemployment comes about as the result of a law passed by Congress, the highest duty is laid upon the Government to afford relief to the suffering workers. Especially is this the case where the law involves interference with the normal activities of a business enterprise.

I refer, as a particular instance, to the Guffey coal bill. It has had effect in my district to reduce the activities of the mines and to increase the sufferings of the unemployed. Men who had jobs before the Guffey coal bill was passed now find themselves out of work as the direct result of its operations. I could name several mines in my district which have been forced to shut down because of this law. It has worked out very much as I believed it was designed to work, to wit, it has had a harmful effect on the high-cost mines.

Many of my friends were surprised by the violent and abusive criticism heaped upon me by a group of so-called labor leaders in radio speeches on last Thursday night over station WBRC, Birmingham. My friends knew that I was an old friend of the men who labor, that I had long been a believer in the organization of labor and had supported organized labor in many of its efforts, so that they could not understand why I should be now abused and vilified by this group. Some of them perhaps were tempted to say, "I knew it would come about; I told HUDDLESTON long ago that labor had no gratitude and that no matter how faithful he might be, labor would turn against him." I defend labor against this charge. Those who spoke over the radio were not from the rank and file of labor, they were merely labor politicians who manage to live off other men's labor without

doing any labor themselves. Their voice is not the voice of the rank and file of the men who do the honest toil.

There are, of course, all kinds of labor leaders; some good, some bad, just as in other groups we find among them some honest men and some who are crooks; some are loyal to the cause, others always look out for number one; some are devoted servants of the rank and file, others sell them out every chance they get. These parasites of labor are called "labor skates", and it is not fair to condemn all labor because an occasional unworthy man may be found among them.

My service to organized labor has been on the basis of principle. I am sympathetic with all men who toil. I believe in organized labor as the bulwark of all working men whether organized or unorganized. In serving labor, I have been no abject slave. I have done what I thought was right. It has so happened that in the vast majority of cases I have been able to go conscientiously along with labor's program. In a few instances I have had convictions which did not permit me to do so.

In the list of my votes which these labor speakers criticized were votes on the social-security bill, the holding-company bill, and the Guffey coal bill. Of these the interest of labor was opposed to the passage of the holding-company bill as it meant fewer jobs and a reduction in employment. Probably, except for my efforts, the streetcar employees of my home city would now find themselves working for a court receiver if they had any work at all. The security bill was not a labor bill. In some respects it was antilabor. It lays a tax up to 3 percent upon the wages of employees. You will yet hear a lot of complaint about this measure before we are done with it.

On the Guffey bill I plead guilty. It was a so-called labor measure. I voted against it. In doing so I incurred the enmity of John Lewis, president of the United Mine Workers, and his order for my destruction was sent down to his handy man, Mr. Mitch, president of the Alabama United Mine Workers district, who was the leading speaker against me over radio. I knew that I would have trouble with Lewis because of my vote on the Guffey bill, but I could not allow my political interests to interfere with my duty to my own coal miners and to the other people in my district who are concerned with the mining industry. I could not betray my district to save my own skin. The Guffey bill, as I shall explain later, was aimed directly in this district and was intended to destroy its mining industry.

Lewis is an able man, but ruthless and tyrannical. He is now making war on craft unionism and threatens to disrupt the American Federation of Labor. If Lewis has his way all craft unions will be put out of business.

Lewis proclaims to the world that the trouble with the mining industry is that we have too many miners and too many mines and that the welfare of the industry requires that all high-cost mines be shut down and the industry concentrated into the rich coal fields of Kentucky, West Virginia, Pennsylvania, and the other States of the central territory. This means that the industry in the lean coal fields, such as Alabama, Arkansas, Oklahoma, and elsewhere, will be destroyed. If Lewis has his way, the production of Alabama coal will be reduced to merely supplying the local demand. This is what he is driving for.

It is possible that Lewis is right and that if the coal business is concentrated in the rich fields, they could be better organized, wages placed on a higher basis, and everybody concerned with it benefited. This might be best for the industry as a whole, but it would be ruinous to our Alabama coal industry. It would mean starvation to thousands of families there who live off the coal business. It would strike a fatal blow to Birmingham, my home city. I would be a traitor, indeed, if, knowing this as I did, I had supported the Guffey bill.

This bill was drawn by Lewis' attorney. He had it introduced and secured its approval by the administration. Then he sent his henchmen out to get pledges of support from their Congressmen. Mr. Mitch came to my office and insisted that I support the bill. I did not discuss it with him,

as I knew it was useless to do so. I made him no promises. He threatened that there would be a strike if the bill was not passed, but this did not affect my view. I knew what this bill was and what it was intended to do. Of course, he was disappointed. He went out of my office and has been uttering dire threats and criticism against me ever since. When I voted against the bill I knew that my doom was sealed so far as Mitch and Lewis were concerned. His Thursday night speech was merely carrying out the orders given Mitch by Lewis.

When the mine workers reorganized in Alabama in 1933 Mitch was sent down here by Lewis to take charge. He had been for years a hanger-on and handy man for Lewis. He had been living off the humble mine workers, but it had been a long time since he had done a stroke of honest labor. He was about as much of a miner as I am.

Lewis sent Mitch down here to take charge. We had our old faithful miners' officials here, such as Joe Clemo and Will Harrison, but Lewis sent down his own hired man to represent him. Lewis is in charge of this U. M. W. district. Mitch merely does what Lewis tells him to do. If he should fail for a single day to obey his orders, Mitch would go hiking back to Indiana, where he came from. In only a technical sense is Mitch a citizen of Alabama. Up until a few weeks ago he was not a voter in this State. He was just a carpetbagger from Indiana giving orders to our coal diggers.

Many do not know it, but the fact is that our mine workers' district is governed by a dictator. The miners are allowed no voice in governing themselves. They are ordered to strike without any vote. Then they are ordered to go back whenever Mitch and his boss Lewis want them to go back to work. They have nothing to say on either wages or conditions. Mitch is the Hitler of the Alabama mining district, and no criticism of him or question of his authority is tolerated. The oldest and most loyal member of the mine workers in Alabama was kicked out of the union because he dared to criticize the autocratic way in which they are ruled.

Mr. Mitch was unused to power in Indiana. When he got down to Alabama he suddenly found himself a big man and it went to his head. What is the matter with him is that he is a dictator through the power of the predominating numbers of his mine workers. And there hangs the tale of Alabama labor politics which I am relating.

Labor politicians are also of all sorts and kinds. Some of them are trying to get political positions, others are seeking preferment in the labor movement. Of course, some are honest and unselfish men. Among those in Alabama who are looking for political and labor jobs, it is generally recognized and well known that they are out of luck unless they are able to stand in with Mr. Mitch. Mitch has become the labor dictator of Alabama through the power of the mine workers. They are so numerous that they have a controlling influence in labor bodies. By making a few shrewd trades Mitch has a majority at such meetings. Any labor leader who does not kow-tow to Mitch is cut off from preferment in the organizations and from any chance to promote his own interests. This is known to every well-informed labor man in the Birmingham district.

By the means I have described Mitch was able to control the recent convention of the Alabama State Federation of Labor. He attended the convention backed with his followers. It was either knuckle under to Mitch and go along with him or no labor politician could hope for anything. Mitch had himself elected as State president. He had others elected to other offices, and all of them have got to do what Mitch says or get out. It is small wonder that Mitch has their help in carrying out Lewis' orders to destroy me. This is the explanation of the criticism that they make against me.

If the Supreme Court does not strike down the Guffey bill, our poor old coal miners in due time will find out what has been done to them. They have been betrayed by one who had sworn to protect their interests. This mining district is being run not in the interest of the men who work here but in the interest of John Lewis and in the interest of the rich

central fields. The time will come when this will be fully disclosed. I am willing to wait for that time in order to receive the approval which our coal miners ought now to feel for me. I am speaking now as a matter of duty, not for any political benefit. I do not want to stir up any strife in the miners' unions, but it is my duty to tell these men, hundreds of whom are my personal friends, that their interests are being betrayed by those sworn to protect them who have turned traitor to them. I am not one of these. I have been faithful.

I will not allow Mr. Mitch and his buccaneers to seize the good ship of labor in Alabama without telling the crew that he is driving them onto the rocks. Under Mitch leadership the State federation is bound for ruin. If he has his way, the labor movement in Alabama will receive the hardest blow that it has ever sustained.

I was not the aggressor in this scrap. Mitch started in on me first. He deserves to be exposed. The laboring people of Alabama, and particularly those connected with the mining industry, should send this Indiana carpetbagger back to his own home. We have got sense enough to run our own business. We call on Mr. Lewis: "Take your dictator back; our miners want the right to run their own affairs and to control their own business."

Mr. McFARLANE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro-forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I do not want to detain the House unnecessarily, but under this particular section of the bill, National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, I do want to call the attention of the Members to the importance of the work of this organization. The information they have should be made available to all Members of the House at all times. This bureau collects world-wide information on the status of all aviation matters. I believe you will agree with me that it is very important that we annually provide definite information in the way of charts such as I placed in the RECORD 2 years ago, showing definitely the exact status of all war planes and engines in the world, and their comparative strength. This bureau because of its set-up can definitely furnish this information and should furnish it to some agency such as the Congressional Library where this information may be carefully checked and be available to all Members of Congress. I have introduced legislation of this kind, and at this point, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and make this bill a part of my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered. There was no objection.

H. R. 12629

A bill to provide the Congress with information on the state of development of the aerial war craft of the United States in comparison with that of other nations

Be it enacted, etc., That the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics shall be required to prepare annually and deposit in the Library of Congress, the first week in January, 100 copies of a confidential report for the use of the Military and Naval Affairs Committees, furnishing essential data with ready-reference charts and tables comparing the specifications, performance, and other military qualifications of the war craft of the United States with those of the other leading air powers of the world. The sources, both public and confidential, of such information shall be cited so fully and specifically that the Library of Congress can readily check or verify all the data of said report.

In preparing this annual report the advisory committee may use its own secret files, and shall have the cooperation of the United States Air Service and the use of their secret files. The Library of Congress shall keep its copies of the report confidential in locked cases, except insofar as made public by Congress, and shall promptly check the statements of the report against information available in its own collections, and shall file copies of such check in ready form for use with the report itself.

Mr. STACK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to return to page 3, line 16, to offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to return to page 3, line 16, for the purpose of offering an amendment. Is there objection?

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, and I certainly do not want to be discourteous to any of my colleagues, but it is going to be absolutely im-

possible to go forward with this program if we turn back. I am awfully sorry, but I shall have to object.

Mr. STACK. This message came to me from the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAY], who asked me to offer this amendment, but the message came too late. In fairness to him and to the people interested, I think the gentleman ought to make an exception.

Mr. WOODRUM. I should like to make an exception, but there are many Members who want to turn back. One of our colleagues on the other side wanted to turn back just a while ago, and I was forced to object.

Mr. STACK. I am not asking for an additional appropriation.

Mr. WOODRUM. I appreciate that, and I think all the Members ought to be treated alike. I objected to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky, and I am forced to object to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. STACK].

Mr. STACK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point the amendment I was about to offer.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The amendment referred to follows:

Page 3, line 16, after the comma, insert the following names: V. G. Andrews, Michael Kostick, and Walter C. Stewart, messengers on night and day duty during the second session of the Seventy-Fourth Congress, \$500 each; in all the sum of \$3,500, to be paid from the appropriation for printing and binding for Congress for the fiscal year 1936.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last four words.

Mr. Chairman, I have made some study of this bill, and I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, the appropriation bill we have under consideration, among other things, appropriates the money necessary for unemployment relief for the next fiscal year in the sum of \$1,425,000,000.

Every taxpayer in the United States is interested in how this money is to be expended.

To provide a means to take care of unemployed labor in the country, the present administration has created two organizations—the Public Works Administration, extending to every State and, I may say, every community in the Nation; the other, the Works Progress Administration, which is a reorganization of the Federal Emergency Relief Administration. The Public Works Administration was the Government agency created to finance permanent public-works projects on a sound and economical basis, constituting an organization of efficient and trained technical personnel. Branches in every State have been set up, commonly referred to as the P. W. A. The record of the P. W. A. in providing the means for economical construction of permanent and valuable public-works projects throughout the Nation is too well known for me to go into details here. Under the plan of this Administration any projects undertaken will be financed to insure completion.

It appears that the Works Progress Administration was created to take up the slack in unemployment, and was designed and intended primarily to create jobs for the unemployed, and to relieve an emergency in unemployment throughout the country.

In studying the provisions of this bill we find that no funds are appropriated for the Public Works Administration, although we know that projects totaling over \$700,000,000 have been examined and approved by the Public Works Administration on which work can be started as soon as the necessary funds are appropriated. It is also well known that in connection with hundreds of these projects communities

throughout the country have approved bond issues with the expectation of doing their share only to find now that the Public Works Administration is unable to proceed because of lack of funds. While no money is provided to finance this great constructive program of essential projects, all funds appropriated in this bill for unemployment relief are to be handed over to the W. P. A., a temporary emergency organization.

The money is to be spent on many projects which are of little permanent value, a considerable number of which will not be completed. Mr. Chairman, I believe we have met the emergency situation in unemployment, and the time has come when any funds spent to relieve unemployment should finance the construction of permanent projects on a sound and economic basis. For this reason I am in favor of dividing the proposed appropriation of \$1,425,000,000 in this bill and setting aside \$700,000,000 for the Public Works Administration to finance the projects that have been and will be approved under the plans and direction of this organization, leaving the remainder of the appropriation for the W. P. A. to carry out the plan for which it was created; that is, to take up slack unemployment and relieve any emergency.

Mr. Chairman, I propose to vote for such an amendment.

The pro-forma amendments were withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

Printing and binding: For an additional amount for printing and binding, Smithsonian Institution, including the same objects specified under this head in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1936, fiscal year 1936, \$12,000, to remain available until June 30, 1937.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I recently made a public statement in which I stated I heartily approved of proper relief for the needy and advocated its management and distribution through State agencies rather than through regimentation and bureaucracy here in Washington. I stand on that principle now. I think the bill before us, continuing the bungling, bureaucratic, boondoggling methods in the present distribution of aid, is entirely wrong. It is wrong from the standpoint of waste, extravagance, and graft and from the standpoint of results. If anyone can claim that the Hopkins' method of relief expenditure and waste of large sums of money is anything but a dismal failure, I should like to hear it. Why continue it?

Mr. Chairman, according to the Treasury's own figures, Congress has already appropriated nearly eighteen billions for recovery and relief, yet we still have 11,000,000 unemployed and 20,000,000 on relief. The necessity for relief continues unabated, which proves conclusively that the administration has failed to solve the problem, or even make any improvement.

We have nothing to show for the billions that have been squandered except the size of the national debt, which will have been piled up to the unprecedented total of thirty-four billions by next July. This colossal debt will have to be paid by present and future generations, including the present beneficiaries of the relief program. After the additional billion and a half dollars provided by this bill have been spent we will still have the unemployment and relief problem with us.

The worst feature of the present relief set-up is that nearly half the funds are used up in overhead and waste and never get to those in need. The only thing it has done is to set up a fine political machine; and I am opposed to using either public funds for this purpose or telling those in need that they must apply to the political machinery of the present administration in order to get relief. That is entirely wrong in principle, as well as being a waste and extravagance, so far as the money of the people is concerned.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot see why as great a committee as we know the Appropriations Committee is should bring in a bill here involving \$2,364,000,000 without giving the House an opportunity to see it inside of 24 hours before it is brought up on the floor, and then brag in the report, as they do, that it is \$23,859,000 less than the Budget estimate. It seems to

me that \$23,000,000 in savings is really worth while; but, on the other hand, when you figure it is only 1 percent of the tremendous aggregate involved in this bill, it is a very minor matter to call to the attention of the Members of the House and the country.

I am absolutely opposed to the conditions under which the Democratic Party today is offering this bill to the country. As I have said, I am in favor of relief for the needy, and always have been, but I wish it were possible to vote on this matter on the basis of Federal and State cooperation, with the distribution of funds through State agencies. Let us do away with this bureaucratic form of government, this waste and extravagance, and set up common-sense business principles in connection with the use of the taxpayers' money.

The only real solution of the unemployment problem will come through increased private employment, but the policies of the present administration have all tended to harass business and prevent or discourage expansion and reemployment. At the same time, the reckless spending that is going on and the loose fiscal policy that is being pursued each generate fear and create uncertainty as to the future. Some day the Treasury's ability to borrow money with which to carry on the administration's reckless and wasteful expenditures will cease. There will not be any chance of obtaining further loans, and when that time comes chaos will follow.

If the administration would put recovery ahead of reform, and would adopt definite and sound monetary and fiscal policies, business would undoubtedly take great strides forward, and the necessity for relief would largely disappear. In the meantime, however, if the administration of relief expenditures were transferred to the States, with the Federal Government contributing thereto, there is no doubt but that a great saving in the cost could be effected and that those in need would be better and more adequately cared for.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The pro-forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of the act entitled "The Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933", approved May 18, 1933 (U. S. C., title 16, ch. 12a), as amended by the act approved August 31, 1935 (49 Stat. 1075-1081), including the continued construction of Norris Dam, Wheeler Dam, Pickwick Landing Dam, Guntersville Dam, and Chickamauga Dam (hereafter to be known as McReynolds Dam), and the beginning of construction on a dam on the Hiwassee River, a tributary of the Tennessee River, at or near Fowler Bend, and the continuation of preliminary investigations as to the appropriate location and type of a dam on the lower Tennessee River, and the acquisition of necessary land, the clearing of such land, relocation of highways, and the construction or purchase of transmission lines and other facilities, and all other necessary works authorized by such acts, and for printing and binding, law books, books of reference, newspapers, periodicals, purchase, maintenance, and operation of passenger-carrying vehicles, rents in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, and all necessary salaries and expenses connected with the organization, operation, and investigations of the Tennessee Valley Authority, fiscal year 1937, \$39,900,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation and any unexpended balance on June 30, 1936, in the "Tennessee Valley Authority Fund, 1936", and the receipts of the Tennessee Valley Authority from all sources during the fiscal year 1937 (except as limited by sec. 26 of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933, as amended), shall be covered into and accounted for as one fund to be known as the "Tennessee Valley Authority Fund, 1937", to remain available until June 30, 1937, and to be available for the payment of obligations chargeable against the "Tennessee Valley Authority Fund, 1936."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TABER: Page 19, line 4, after the word "Dam", the parenthesis, and the comma, strike out the words "and the beginning of construction on a dam on the Hiwassee River, a tributary of the Tennessee River, at or near Fowler Bend"; and line 18, page 19, strike out the sign and figures "\$39,900,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$35,562,772."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, this is an opportunity to save \$4,337,000 and not appropriate any money for the beginning of the Hiwassee Dam. The Tennessee Valley Authority was authorized by an appropriation which was carried last year to begin construction of this dam. They did not begin construction of the dam, but decided among themselves that they would like to begin the construction of a dam known as the

Fontana Dam, by which they could go to the Aluminum Co. of America and pay \$3,000,000 for a piece of property that I understand changed hands a little while ago for \$250,000.

Mr. Chairman, they came to the committee and asked the committee to change the language so that, instead of building the Hiwassee Dam, they could build the Fontana Dam and go into that matter, but the committee did not give them this privilege. The committee did insert the language I am trying to strike out here, which permitted them to go ahead with the Hiwassee Dam.

The major items of flood control there are the so-called Norris Dam up the Clinch River, the Chickamauga Dam, which is above Chattanooga, and the Guntersville Dam below. It does not seem to me that this dam on the Hiwassee River, a branch stream, which will cost nearly \$20,000,000, should be proceeded with. It is not necessary from a power standpoint or a flood-control standpoint, and it is absolutely ridiculous to go into the proposition. Why not erect the dams that are already started and not build any more until we know more about how this is going to work out and see just what kind of thing it is that is in front of us.

I hope the Committee will adopt this amendment.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I listened with interest to my friend the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] stating that the Tennessee Valley Authority proposed to pay the owners of the Fontana site \$3,000,000 for this site. That is not correct. The proposition was to allow them \$3,000,000 worth of electric energy. They were to pay for the site with the electrical energy to the extent of \$3,000,000 at the established rate.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Yes.

Mr. TABER. Is it the gentleman's idea that the \$3,000,000 of electrical energy is not worth anything?

Mr. BUCHANAN. It is my idea it is not the same as \$3,000,000 in cash; but this is aside from the question here.

This Congress at the last session made an appropriation of \$1,000,000 to commence the construction of Hiwassee Dam. The Hiwassee Dam was investigated both by the Appropriations Committee of the House and the Appropriations Committee of the Senate, and these two committees came to the conclusion that it is essential to the flood-prevention work in this area. It will ultimately produce power, but there is no intention of putting in extensive power machinery at that dam at the time of construction. It is essential for flood prevention and it is essential for navigation. Therefore, the committee thinks this provision should be left in the bill.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

I wish to call the attention of the Committee to the fact that this is another increase for T. V. A. You have been asked to increase the appropriations for dams for the T. V. A. for the last 2 years. Where are you going to get the money? [Laughter and applause.] You will find that the dams that you are now authorizing will only rise up to damn you in the future, and it is time you stopped damming this country. Let me show you that you are doing it. I read on page 19, lines 1 to 4:

Including the continued construction of Norris Dam, Wheeler Dam, Pickwick Landing Dam, Guntersville Dam, and Chickamauga Dam.

Do you not think it is time to get the Government out of all kinds of business that interferes with its citizens? Stop Russianism, communism, and socialism.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro-forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I do not often take the time of the House, but there is one thing in this provision of the bill that, in my judgment, is so well deserved that I could not spare this opportunity of calling attention to it.

In lines 3 and 4, on page 19, the name of the Chickamauga Dam is to be changed to McReynolds Dam.

Perhaps no Member of Congress is more familiar with the record of Judge McREYNOLDS with regard to the Tennessee River than I am. Ever since he has been a Member of the Congress he has constantly appeared before the Committee on Rivers and Harbors from time to time in behalf of some provision with regard to the Tennessee River. He has shown more familiarity with it than any other man of my knowledge who is a Member of this body, and perhaps no one except the engineers of the War Department is more familiar with every phase of the Tennessee River, from its head to its mouth, than Judge SAM D. McREYNOLDS, of Tennessee. I am heartily in favor of this honor which, it seems, is about to be conferred upon him. [Applause.]

Mr. McSWAIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. McSWAIN. As chairman of the legislative committee, the gentleman recognizes the great importance of preserving the rights of legislative committees, does he not?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Certainly.

Mr. McSWAIN. And the gentleman recognizes that this is legislation. I have an amendment that will deal with the situation at the proper time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TABER) there were—ayes 51, noes 102.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. FORD of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 19, in line 2, after the words "Pickwick Landing Dam", insert the following: "hereafter to be known as 'Rankin Dam'."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on that. I wonder if the chairman of the Military Affairs Committee is going to protect the committee.

Mr. McSWAIN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Mississippi wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. FORD of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I realize that it is legislation on an appropriation bill, and I submit it to the Chair for a ruling.

The CHAIRMAN. It is very clear that it is legislation on an appropriation bill, and the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. FORD of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I offer another amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 19, line 2, after the words "Pickwick Landing Dam", insert the following: "(known as 'Rankin Dam')."

Mr. McSWAIN. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order on the amendment that it is legislation on an appropriation bill. It is evidently an attempt to change the name and call it "Rankin Dam." It is in the teeth of legislation that has been attempted time and time again. There are bills before the Committee on Military Affairs to change the name of this dam to "Rankin Dam."

Mr. KNUTSON. I should like to ask the gentleman if it is not customary to wait until the man is dead before they name a dam for him?

Mr. McSWAIN. Yes; it is.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Mississippi wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, if the Chair will permit.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is not legislation. It is language merely descriptive, and such amendments have been repeatedly held not to be legislation.

I recall two decisions on this point. They were made by one of the greatest parliamentarians who has served in the House, James R. Mann, of Illinois.

The first was made in 1905 when an amendment was offered, I think, to the Naval bill.

The language provided that ships or armament should be of "native manufacture." The proposition was defended, as I recollect, by Mr. Olmsted, of Pennsylvania. At any rate the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole, Mr. James R. Mann, of Illinois, held that those words were merely descriptive and that it was not legislation.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield with pleasure to the distinguished leader on the other side of the House.

Mr. SNELL. If the words are merely descriptive, why will they have the effect of changing the name of the dam?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. They do not change the name of the dam. It is not proposed to change the name of the dam.

Mr. SNELL. But is not that the intention? I call it legislation. Is not that the intention of the amendment?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman from New York, being one of the ablest parliamentarians in the House, knows that the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may not speculate as to the intention of an amendment. He must predicate his decision on the amendment before him in the language in which it is written. He cannot go back of what is on the face of it to surmise what is the purpose of a Member in offering an amendment. This amendment merely further describes the Pickwick Landing Dam; it does not propose a change in the name; it merely adds the descriptive language "known as the Rankin Dam."

Mr. SNELL. What is the purpose of offering that amendment at this time and at this place if it is not to change the name of the dam?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. As I have said, the purpose of the proponent is not a question before the Chairman of the Committee. However, a careful reading of the amendment indicates that it is offered for the purpose of clarifying the provision in the bill and more definitely describing the dam, to which the appropriation applies, and therefore is not subject to a point of order. Words merely descriptive are not legislation.

Mr. PETTENGILL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Certainly.

Mr. PETTENGILL. If a bill were introduced and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs to change the description of the existing dam to some other description, would that be properly referred to a legislative committee?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Of course, no such bill is before us. The suggestion cannot have the slightest application to the point at issue.

Mr. Chairman, the same question came up again in 1908. It is reported, as I recall, in section 8524 of the old supplement to the precedents, and by a coincidence, Mr. Mann was again Chairman of the Committee of the Whole. In passing on the question, Mr. Mann again held that words merely descriptive were not legislation. That is the rule of the House. Words merely descriptive cannot be construed as legislation. The question then arises, Is this amendment merely descriptive? I am certain anyone who reads it will find it impossible to place any other construction on it.

The additional language makes more definite, more accurate, more specific the particular dam to be provided for. It merely further describes it. The dam is located adjacent to Mr. RANKIN'S district. Mr. RANKIN has had more to do with it than any other Member of Congress. He has been more closely identified with it and has rendered greater service in the enactment of this class of legislation than any other Member of the House, and it is only natural that we should know of it and speak of it as the Rankin Dam, and to make certain there will be no question about it in the consideration of this piece of legislation we further describe it here as the Rankin Dam.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I am glad to yield to my friend from Texas, the chairman of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I say to the gentleman from Missouri that Pickwick Landing is really not the name of the dam anyway. That is descriptive also. The dam was first authorized in the river and harbor appropriation bill of 1930, to be located at Pickwick Landing, but the dam has never been constructed. It is now under construction, but it has no name in fact.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I am glad to have the gentleman from Texas bear out my contention. That is all the more reason why this amendment should be held in order and this language added to the bill. The chairman of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors testifies to the need of it. He says that the Pickwick Landing Dam is not the name of it. It is doubly necessary therefore to designate it by a name about which there can be no doubt, a name everyone will recognize and understand—the Rankin Dam.

Mr. McSWAIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. First let me answer the question of the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. McSWAIN. But the gentleman from Texas is in error.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I shall yield to the gentleman in time. I am very fond of the gentleman from South Carolina. He and I are both of Irish extraction. But I am certain he would not want me to be discourteous to the chairman of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors by failing to answer his inquiry. He says that is not the name of it. Then we must be specific, we must be certain there can be no misunderstanding as to exactly what dam we are legislating on; and so to be certain that there may be no misapprehension, we add the descriptive words "Rankin Dam."

I cite the chairman to section 3864 in Hinds' Precedents and section 1445 in the supplement. In both those sections he will observe it is held that words merely descriptive do not constitute legislation.

Mr. McSWAIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Most assuredly.

Mr. McSWAIN. To correct the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. MANSFIELD], for whom I have the greatest reverence and respect, I refer the gentleman and the Chair to the act of May 18, 1933, setting up the Tennessee Valley Authority, where in section 4, subsection (d), it is specifically stated that such dams and reservoirs in the Tennessee Valley and its tributaries as in conjunction with the Wilson Dam, the Norris Dam, the Pickwick Landing Dam, and so forth, so that it was named by the Congress and approved by the President on May 18, 1933, 3 years after the act referred to by the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. That is a question between the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MANSFIELD] and the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. McSWAIN]. [Laughter.]

Mr. McSWAIN. Oh, no; it is not.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman from Texas states the dam has no name and the gentleman from South Carolina insists that it has. In any event, that is not the question before the House. But in view of the uncertainty between the two gentlemen, who should know more about it than anybody else, let us avoid any possible controversy as to its identity and insert language that everyone will understand and approve. Mr. Chairman, the amendment does not propose to change the name. It merely adds descriptive language more definitely describing it. I submit to you, Mr. Chairman, that words merely descriptive are not legislation, and under the law of the House the amendment is in order.

Mr. SNELL rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule, but the Chair will be glad to hear the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SNELL. I have no desire to take the time of the House if the Chair is prepared to rule.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be glad to hear the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SNELL. The only question I wanted to raise is this: I have no contention with the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] relative to descriptive words; but everyone

knows—and the gentleman admitted in the argument which he had with the gentleman from Texas—that this is for the purpose of naming it the Rankin Dam. As far as I am concerned, I would just as soon have that name as any other, but those are not descriptive words as presented in this amendment, and everybody in the House knows it.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. McCORMACK). The Chair is prepared to rule. The Chair entirely agrees with the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], with reference to the use of descriptive words. Therefore, the question in the mind of the present occupant of the chair is whether the amendment is descriptive or whether it constitutes legislation. Without regard to whether or not it brings about a change in the name of the dam from "Pickwick Landing Dam" to "Rankin Dam", it is the opinion of the Chair, with profound respect for the opinion of the gentleman from Missouri, one of the outstanding parliamentarians of all time, that the amendment does not constitute descriptive language; that it constitutes legislation. It is an addition to the language used in this bill. The Chair would rule the same whether or not the legislation referred to by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. McSWAIN] contained the words "Pickwick Landing Dam" or not, because that name is included in the bill now before the House.

Profoundly respecting the views of the gentleman from Missouri, and with considerable hesitation in disagreeing with him, it is the opinion of the Chair that the point of order is well taken, and the Chair therefore sustains the point of order.

Mr. McSWAIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. McSWAIN: Page 19, line 3, after the word "dam", strike out the parenthesis and the words "hereafter to be known as McReynolds Dam", and the parenthesis following said words.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WHITE. Is this offered as a point of order or as an amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. It is offered as an amendment by the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. WHITE. The gentleman from South Carolina does not raise a point of order, then?

Mr. McSWAIN. I could not raise a point of order. All points of order were waived.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina has offered an amendment which has been reported by the Clerk, and the gentleman is now recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. McSWAIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment from a strict sense of duty, as chairman of the legislative committee having charge of this matter. From what you have heard here you have already seen just where we will get if we start naming dams for Members of this Congress while they are still living. You see plainly where we will get. I will explain just why it is that, although there are several bills pending before the committee that has jurisdiction, as has been held by the Chairman [Mr. McCORMACK], this cannot be done. There is one bill, offered by the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE], to name the Pickwick Landing Dam the John E. Rankin Dam. There is one by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. CHANDLER] to name it the Senator McKellar Dam. There is another one by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. McGEHEE] to name it the Percy Quin Dam; and there is another one pending, offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STARNES] to name the Guntersville Dam the Franklin D. Roosevelt Dam.

The committee has not considered any of those bills. We have had to explain to the gentlemen who have been urging the consideration of those bills the situation we got into the last time. What was it? The last time, when the T. V. A. amendments were before this House, on motion by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FADDIS], this House unanimously adopted an amendment to name Pickwick Landing Dam the "Percy Quin Dam." Percy Quin was formerly chairman of this Committee on Military Affairs and literally gave his life on the 4th of February 1932, fighting the Power

Trust and fighting the Fertilizer Trust to keep them from getting possession of this great natural resource down there. When the bill went to the Senate and went to conference, what were we met with? We were told by the Senate conferees that, even though it was named for a dead man, a former chairman of the committee which had jurisdiction of the matter, a man who gave his life as an evidence of his devotion to the cause of agriculture and adequate fertilizer from that great resource, yet if we started this kind of thing and let it go through, it would produce heartburnings among others that they had not been thus honored. It would cause trouble, and they said, "We, the Senate conferees, beg you, the House conferees, not to insist upon this amendment, although the House has unanimously agreed to it."

Now, we agree to that, but we first had an agreement with the Senate conferees. The men who will probably be in charge of any legislation of this sort in the future agreed to this effect, that they would notify the directors of the T. V. A. that no more dams should be named by them for anybody, dead or alive, and that hereafter the committees of the Houses having jurisdiction of these matters would recommend to the Houses to name dams only for dead people. That is why we have not considered your bills, you the authors of these several bills referred to; we have stuck to that agreement.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MAVERICK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McSWAIN. I yield.

Mr. SNELL. Would it be possible during the expansion of this T. V. A. to build enough dams so that every deserving Democrat could have his name on a dam? [Laughter.]

Mr. McSWAIN. I had hoped that the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, who was active in regard to the legislation before this House on T. V. A. a year ago, every one of whose amendments I supported, and to whom I reported as to the progress of the conference—I had hoped that he would see the wisdom of respecting the legislative committee here and would not oppose this amendment. I am asking him now if he will not agree, because do we not all see where it is going to lead? If you let this stay in, then JOHN RANKIN and all his friends will be sore because they have been cut out.

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McSWAIN. I yield.

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 5 minutes after the gentleman from South Carolina concludes his statement.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from South Carolina yield for the purpose of submitting this unanimous-consent request?

Mr. WOODRUM. It is merely to expedite the consideration of the bill.

Mr. McSWAIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield for that purpose.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia asks unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 5 minutes after the gentleman from South Carolina has concluded his statement. Is there objection?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. MAVERICK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. McSWAIN. I yield.

Mr. MAVERICK. Was a noted battle fought there?

Mr. McSWAIN. Yes; the Battle of Chickamauga was fought upon the high ground just above there, and it is a historical name that will stay in history for all time. Tens of thousands of men took part in that desperate battle. It is a name that should stand and be kept in memory forever.

Now, I love my friend from Tennessee, and I have honored him; I have paid tribute on this floor to the part he has taken. The Record will show that I have spoken for him; but if we start this, Mr. Chairman, I will tell you where we

are going to end: When it gets to the Senate there will be a scramble to strike out the House name and put in the name of some Senator. We had better be careful. We had better name it the Andrew Jackson Dam or the Andrew Johnson Dam, or the James K. Polk Dam—after men from Tennessee who became Presidents of the United States.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McSWAIN. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. Is it not a fact that the Norris Dam was named after a living Senator—Senator NORRIS?

Mr. McSWAIN. Yes; and Senator NORRIS agreed it should stop right there. He expressed regret it had been done. He was one of the Senate conferees.

Mr. WHITE. I would agree to that, too, had I been in his place.

Mr. McSWAIN. He did not start it. He regretted it, and I believe he was as sincere in that as in anything else he ever said.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment may close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment may close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, this is a controversial amendment. I object.

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Virginia.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. First, gentlemen, let us cool down. We are spending about half an hour over the mere name of a dam in a bill that carries \$2,365,000,000. It looks to me like foolishness, and we should stop. That is why we want this debate closed.

First, I want to vindicate the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. McREYNOLDS] from initiating the naming of this dam for himself. It was not initiated by him; he had nothing to do with initiating it. In fact, the bill follows what now is the name of the dam down there in his district. They had a great gathering down there when it was known this dam was to be constructed, a barbecue, or whatever you want to call it. They were his constituents; his people; Tennesseans. A motion was made and unanimously carried that the dam be named "McReynolds Dam."

The committee adopted the name which had been suggested by the people who live where the dam is being constructed.

Mr. MAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. Can the gentleman inform the Members of the House that there was nobody in that vast crowd that sponsored the naming of this dam who was friendly to the gentleman?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Of course, his friends sponsored the name down there. Now, one word as to what the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. McSWAIN] and his colleague in the Senate decided to do. They do not want to name anything for a living man. Do we have to die and go to that great unknown in order to receive a little honor and recognition at the hands of our Government? I am one of those who believe in giving flowers to the living as well as to the dead.

Mr. Chairman, Mr. McREYNOLDS has made a splendid Congressman. He has devoted his life work to getting this dam started. I think it would be very befitting to name it after him.

Mr. SNELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SNELL. Regardless of the merits of the individual service that any of these gentlemen may render in the House, does the gentleman think it is good policy to name these public projects that happen to be in a certain Congressman's district after that Congressman?

Mr. BUCHANAN. If it is in the Congressman's district and he has devoted his life and energies to it, and made sacrifices for it, I have no objection to that procedure, and I think it would be a just and honest tribute to pay to the Congressman. God knows, we get few tributes otherwise.

Mr. Chairman, that is all I have to say. My friend from South Carolina [Mr. McSWAIN] says this is legislation on an appropriation bill, but remember this does not come within the ruling of the Chair. The Pickwick Dam was named in the law that created the Tennessee Valley Authority. The Chickamauga Dam is not. We have followed Mr. McREYNOLDS' own constituents in the naming of this dam.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Chairman, I do not care to take up the full time allotted me under the rules of the House. It is well known by the Members that I have rarely taken the floor upon controversial questions because, as a matter of fact, presiding over the House as I do, I have always felt that insofar as possible I should maintain a nonpartisan attitude. But this dam is located in my own State. I know something of the work that the distinguished Congressman from the Third District of Tennessee has done with reference to the establishment of this dam. I therefore feel that I should be excused if I take this opportunity to express my own personal opinion and my own personal hope with reference to the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I know what Judge McREYNOLDS has done with reference to the establishment of this dam. I know, and I choose my words when I make this statement, that if it had not been for Judge McREYNOLDS there would be no dam there at the present time. It might have come in the future. It was due to his earnest insistence and his knowledge of the necessities of the situation that the dam was located there and is now in process of construction. I think this is a merited tribute to pay to the gentleman, and I think it is a deserving honor to call it McReynolds Dam in recognition of his work. [Applause.]

The people down in his district who are familiar with his work, who are familiar with what he has done, desire this dam to be named the McReynolds Dam in recognition of his faithful service as their Congressman. I think the same might properly be said of the entire State of Tennessee.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment will be defeated. I cannot agree with those who say that because Judge McREYNOLDS is living this dam should not be named for him. Congress can take care of those things in the future. Congress can distinguish in the future with reference to the naming of dams or any other Government activities in the Nation. I think this is a case where his colleagues who respect and admire him have the opportunity not only to do him honor, but to do him justice by the rejection of this amendment. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. McSWAIN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. McLEAN) there were—ayes 40, noes 110.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PEARSON: On page 19, line 8, after the word "river", insert the words "and the beginning of construction of a dam on the lower Tennessee River."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

Mr. PEARSON. Will the gentleman withhold his point of order?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. Chairman, this amendment, if adopted, will provide for the beginning of construction during the next fiscal year of a necessary dam on the Tennessee River.

The amendment, if adopted, will not increase the amount of appropriation carried in the bill, nor will it increase the expenditures ultimately expected to be made by the Tennessee Valley Authority if Congress continues to approve the plan as outlined by that Authority. It simply carries a specific authorization for the beginning of construction of a dam on the lower Tennessee River during the year 1937 instead of 1939. It happens to be a dam which the directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority have already definitely approved and one which they say will be necessary in order to complete a unified system of transportation on the river.

Under the committee report and under the provisions carried in this bill, there has been allocated for exploring and for preliminary investigations for a dam on the lower Tennessee River the sum of \$650,000. You will find this in the committee report when, as a matter of fact, the directors of the Authority, in their report rendered to this Congress on April 1, definitely state that the dam is to be located at a point near Gilbertsville, Ky. So any investigating or any exploring to the extent of over one-half million dollars is absolutely unnecessary, uncalled for, and would be a useless expenditure of that sum of money.

I am offering this amendment in good faith, and I am not offering it for the purpose of obtaining a dam in my district. As a matter of fact, this dam, according to present plans, is to be located in the district of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. GREGORY], but not far removed from my district.

Mr. Chairman, the Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority are preparing and planning to build a dam across the Tennessee and the Ohio Rivers at Paducah, at an expenditure of \$200,000,000, if the Congress should approve it; and in the event a dam is constructed on the lower Tennessee at or near Gilbertsville, or at Aurora, as originally planned, it will cost \$60,000,000 to construct it, and for this Congress to authorize its immediate construction will mean a saving to the taxpayers of this country in the amount of \$140,000,000 unless the plans of the Directors of the Authority go awry.

I am not objecting to the Ohio River being developed when and if it becomes necessary, but I say it is the duty of the Congress to require the Tennessee Valley Authority to complete the program for which it was created—and that is, the full development of the Tennessee River—and not permit it to branch out in exploiting other rivers until this program has been completed.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. COOPER of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, I would like to see if we can get a unanimous-consent agreement to close debate on this amendment in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman understands there is a reservation of a point of order pending?

Mr. McLEAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Virginia yield?

Mr. WOODRUM. Certainly.

Mr. McLEAN. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment which I would be pleased to withhold, but I would like to have 3 or 4 minutes to make some observations, and if I could have this time in opposition to the pending amendment I shall withhold my own amendment.

Mr. WOODRUM. Then, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 10 minutes following the remarks of the gentleman from Tennessee, who has just been granted an additional 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. Chairman, I shall not take the additional 5 minutes, but I want to make this further observation.

One week ago yesterday the two Senators from Kentucky and the two Senators from my own State and the Representative from Kentucky [Mr. GREGORY] and myself had a conference with the President of the United States with reference to the amendment to which I am now addressing myself, and the President expressed his approval of the amendment which I am offering, stating that he had no desire or disposition to agree to anything which would upset the balanced plan of procedure as outlined by the directors of the Authority, but that this dam on the lower Tennessee had to be completed before the projects outlined by the Authority would ever be worth anything and that he personally acquiesced in the beginning of immediate construction of a dam on the lower Tennessee and would have no objection to increasing the allocation of \$650,000, as shown in the committee's report, to \$1,000,000 for the purpose of using the appropriation in actual construction work on this dam.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PEARSON. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Is it not a fact that the construction of this dam is necessary to link the Tennessee with the Ohio for navigation?

Mr. PEARSON. The money heretofore spent on the Tennessee River will never be of any value to the people from Pickwick Landing Dam to Paducah, Ky., until this dam is completed. It is about 264 miles from Paducah to Pickwick Landing Dam, and the construction of a dam at Gilbertsville, Ky., or Aurora, will guarantee a 9-foot uniform channel in the river from the dam site to Pickwick Landing Dam, and without it no transportation facilities will ever be available on that section of the river, and without this the people that far removed from Pickwick Landing Dam no doubt will be deprived of the privileges of cheap power.

Mr. Chairman, I am not asking for a dam simply because I think it would be advantageous to me to have it in this section but I am trying to get it in order to unify the program which this Congress has authorized the Tennessee Valley Authority to carry out and to forestall the Authority in its evident desire and ambition to embrace the Ohio, the Tennessee, and perhaps other rivers, and undertaking to put over an impracticable, extremely expensive, and indefensible program. I had hoped the committee would accept my amendment, and in any event I trust it will be approved by the committee.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York insist upon his point of order?

Mr. TABER. I do, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. TABER. That it is legislation on an appropriation bill and is an item not authorized by law.

Mr. McLEAN. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the gentleman from New York to withhold his point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would like to have some information from the gentleman from Tennessee. Will the gentleman from Tennessee point out to the Chair any existing law which authorizes the construction contemplated by the amendment of the gentleman from Tennessee?

Mr. PEARSON. The act which created the Tennessee Valley Authority provided for the construction of necessary dams on the river to carry out the projects stated therein—that is, for national defense and navigation.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, in order to make my point of order clear, let me say that this is beyond the scope of the Tennessee Valley Authority. The word "necessary" requires the fact to be established in ruling upon the language.

It was stated by the Tennessee Valley Authority in the hearings that this Gilbertsville proposition involved a dam and a canal—a large dam in the Ohio which would cover

operation of both the Cumberland and the Ohio as well as the Tennessee. This Tennessee Valley Authority relates only to the dams entirely within their authority covering the Tennessee only. This goes beyond the scope of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Mr. HILL of Alabama rose.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Alabama wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. HILL of Alabama. I do. Mr. Chairman, the amendment is clearly in order. I call the Chair's attention to section 2, subsection (j), of Public Law 412, Seventy-fourth Congress, which is the amendatory act of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

In setting out the power of the Tennessee Valley Authority to build dams, it says:

Shall have power to construct such dams and reservoirs in the Tennessee River and its tributaries as in conjunction with the Wilson Dam, the Norris Dam, the Wheeler Dam, the Pickwick Landing Dam, now under construction, will produce a 9-foot channel in said river and maintain the water supply from Knoxville to its mouth and best serve to promote navigation in the Tennessee River and its tributaries and control the distribution of its waters in the Tennessee and Mississippi Rivers drainage basin.

I think under the language there can be no question but that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee is in order. The language authorizes construction of any and all dams that may be needed for flood control and navigation of the Tennessee River. All dams from Knoxville to the mouth of the river are authorized. The amendment of the gentleman from Tennessee is undoubtedly in order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule. The amendment of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PEARSON] inserts, after the word "river", line 8, page 19, the words "and the beginning of construction on a dam on the lower Tennessee River." The question as it appears to the Chair is whether or not there is any existing law which authorizes the construction of such a dam. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HILL] has referred to Public, No. 412, of the first session of the Seventy-fourth Congress, which the Chair reads—and, by the way, it is an amendment to the original Tennessee Valley Act:

Sec. 2. That subdivision (j) of said section 4 of said act be, and the same is hereby, amended to read as follows:

"(j) Shall have power to construct such dams and reservoirs in the Tennessee River and its tributaries, as in conjunction with Wilson Dam, and Norris, Wheeler, and Pickwick Landing Dams, now under construction, will provide a 9-foot channel in the said river and maintain a water supply for the same from Knoxville to its mouth, and will best serve to promote navigation on the Tennessee River and its tributaries and control destructive flood waters in the Tennessee and Mississippi River drainage basins; and shall have power to acquire or construct power-houses, power structures, transmission lines, navigation projects, and incidental works in the Tennessee River and its tributaries, and to unite the various power installations into one or more systems by transmission lines. The directors of the Authority are hereby directed to report to Congress their recommendations not later than April 1, 1936, for the unified development of the Tennessee River system."

In the opinion of the Chair, the language just read constitutes an authorization for the appropriation, and the Chair overrules the point of order and holds the amendment to be in order.

Mr. McLEAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. The purpose of my observation at this time is to draw attention to the fact that, in my judgment at least, the Tennessee Valley Authority is not worthy of the confidence of Congress. There is a provision of law which requires that its accounts shall be examined by the Comptroller General of the United States. That is not being done.

Mr. COOPER of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, with all due deference, I am bound to say that the gentleman is not discussing the amendment under consideration. I do not think it is fair to take up the time definitely allotted for the consideration of this amendment by making a general speech on the subject of the T. V. A.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey will proceed in order.

Mr. McLEAN. No further appropriations should be made for any dams until the Tennessee Valley Authority submits its accounts to the Comptroller General and they are examined by him, so that the report required may be made to Congress. It was the intention of Congress that the accounts of the Tennessee Valley Authority should be controlled through examination of the Comptroller General of the United States, but they have contrived to deny the Comptroller General of any supervision, and there is now no way of ascertaining how the funds allocated to this organization are used, except from such information as they themselves care to disseminate, and the reports which the law provides should be made for the information of Congress have not been made this year and will not be made in the future unless Congress takes appropriate action. The Tennessee Valley Authority in the first year and a half of its existence had spent over \$110,000,000 and had obligated the Government far in excess of that amount. In a recent report they forecast expenditures of more than \$379,000,000, and this estimate is made with reservations, which plainly indicate a far greater cost. The law creating the Tennessee Valley Authority intended that it should be in part a self-sustaining undertaking. To date there is no record of any receipts having come to the Government as a result of the operation, and the directors have so enlarged their activities that they are now overlapping and duplicating the work of many Government departments.

By admission of the Authority, completed work and work now under way call for expenditures of \$339,000,000. This does not include all revenue received from the sale of electric power generated and sold at Muscle Shoals since June 1933 and used by the Authority; nor does it include the cost of 34 conservation camps and an army of P. W. A. workers put at the disposal of the Authority in that area; nor does it include large sums from other sources allocated and used for various activities only indirectly connected with dam building, flood control, and national defense. Until its nature, sequence, and ultimate cost are determined, no further appropriation should be made for this undertaking. The unexpended balance of the appropriations should be used to arrive at a logical and sensible plan.

At the last session of Congress the charge was made that the Tennessee Valley Authority was proceeding with its extravagant spending without a logical, prearranged program, and contrary to the orderly procedure arranged by Congress. Its directors were unable to advise Congress of their intentions or what the ultimate cost was going to be, and Congress directed that a report covering these matters be made prior to April 1, 1936. This report was submitted 1 day before it was due, and supports the contention that the mandate of the original act as to future development has been ignored; that at best the plans of the Authority are vague and indefinite. I quote from this report:

In the period of less than 9 months allowed by the act for the preparation of this report, in addition to planning and superintending the construction of dams for which appropriations have been made by Congress, a very large amount of work has been done at numerous other sites in the preparation of this report. A large staff has been engaged in field surveys, in making borings, and in the preparation of comparative plans and estimates at the various sites. The estimates here given are preliminary and are made without full information as to such factors as foundation conditions, the amount of highway and railway relocation necessary, the cost of land, and the amount of reservoir clearing required.

That quotation ought to prove that the Tennessee Valley Authority had no program as charged, that it has no program now, and that no one can tell what the ultimate cost to the Government is going to be because the Authority itself does not know.

Mr. BUCHANAN arose.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. BUCHANAN. To oppose the amendment. How much time remains on the amendment, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. There are 8 minutes remaining.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I desire that my colleague from Kentucky [Mr. GREGORY] I shall have some

time, and if it is agreeable, I shall be very glad to divide the remaining time with him and ask the Chair to notify me at the end of 4 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Chair will conform to the unanimous-consent request of the gentleman from Texas.

There was no objection.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I think the commencement of the construction of this dam comes too early. I do not think a proper investigation has been made. This subject was under consideration in the last Congress and money was given them for further research and \$650,000 more is carried in this bill for investigations and surveys relating to it. The dam will cost, according to the estimate, \$60,000,000. What is the picture? It is close to the Cumberland River and the Ohio River. The T. V. A. board envisions that ultimately also a dam will be put across the Ohio at the mouth of the Cumberland and then a canal will be dug $2\frac{1}{2}$ miles to connect the Tennessee and Cumberland Rivers. That cost would be \$150,000,000. Mr. Chairman, it is too large a project, involving too much money, without further investigation. I am not condemning the project. We may authorize it next year or the year after, but I do not think we ought to enter into any project involving the expenditure of \$60,000,000 and this further possible \$150,000,000 until we know what the ultimate cost will be.

The Tennessee Valley Authority with this proposition is extending its jurisdiction outside of the Tennessee Valley into another State, over another river, the Ohio River, and it is plain that they will get assistance from the Army Engineers. I think we should have enough of an investigation to know what we are doing or to what extent we are involving the National Government. That is my position.

One other thing. The purpose and practically the only purpose of the dam on the lower Tennessee River is to get a 9-foot channel from the mouth to Knoxville. With the completion of the dams now under way, we will have a 7-foot channel, but the Aurora Dam or the Gilbertsville Dam is necessary for a 9-foot channel. Let us complete some of these other dams first. They say they are going to get large revenue from the sale of electric energy. Let us develop this T. V. A. project reasonably and not try to rush every part of it at one time. [Applause.]

Mr. GREGORY. Mr. Chairman, I regret very much that my time will not permit me to go into this situation as I should like to do.

The chairman of the committee has reported that this dam somewhere in the lower Tennessee Valley is necessary in order to carry out the original project. That is admitted by all people. I want to know why in the name of common sense the most essential dam in the whole project shall be left out while they are going up on nonnavigable streams, up in the mountains of eastern Tennessee, Alabama, North Carolina, and various other places. I think probably they are necessary for the conservation and the holding back of floodwaters down there, but I take the opposite view from the chairman of the committee. The first thing we should do is build the most important dam and see what it will do. Then when an opportunity is presented and we find necessity for it, we can build these other dams on the tributaries up in the mountains.

I am like the gentleman from Tennessee. I am not bothered about what the name of this dam shall be at all. If you will put it down there, we will be satisfied with the dam and we will not expect the Tennessee Valley Authority to teach us about thoroughbred cattle or anything like that. We are not trying to dam the Ohio River or the Cumberland River or any other river; but I do think it is a sensible proposition, if they are going to build a dam on the lower Tennessee River, to take into consideration the future. If dams are to be built upon the Ohio or the Cumberland or any other rivers in that vicinity, they certainly ought to be built so as to be of some value to such future development as may be necessary. But there is no opposition here now to do anything on the Ohio or the Cumberland or any other river. The proposition is plainly to start the building of a

dam on the lower Tennessee River, which all agree is essential. It has been so regarded by the Tennessee Valley Authority. It has been so regarded by the Army engineers in the report of 1930 on the rivers and harbors act.

There is no reason in the world why we should not have this two or three hundred thousand additional money given to us in order that the construction of this dam may be started this year. We feel that the folks in western Kentucky and western Tennessee are entitled to some of the distribution of this fund. It is an absolute necessity for the unified control of the Tennessee River to make it navigable. As it is now, building these dams as they are now building them, you have a series of nice little lakes up in the mountains of eastern Tennessee, but by the building of this dam here you will create a great navigable stream, and the others can be built as opportunity is presented.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. GREGORY] has expired.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PEARSON].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. PEARSON) there were ayes 32 and noes 69.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SHORT: On page 20, line 4, after the figures "1936", insert: "Provided, That each Democratic Member of the House shall have named after him some public work costing not less than \$10,000,000."

[Laughter.]

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, while I think there is much merit in the amendment, yet I am forced to make a point of order against the amendment. [Laughter.]

Mr. SHORT. Will the gentleman withhold his point of order for half a minute?

Mr. WOODRUM. I must insist on an immediate ruling on the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 30 seconds.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. DUNN of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The Clerk read as follows:

WORKS PROGRESS ADMINISTRATION

To continue to provide relief, and work relief on useful projects, in the United States and its territories and possessions, by the Works Progress Administration, \$1,425,000,000, to remain available until June 30, 1937 (except as herein otherwise authorized): *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available for the following classes of public projects, Federal and non-Federal, and the amounts to be used for each class shall not, except as hereinafter provided, exceed the respective amounts stated, namely: (a) Highways, roads, and streets, \$413,250,000; (b) public buildings, \$156,750,000; (c) parks and other recreational facilities, including buildings therein, \$156,750,000; (d) public utilities, including sewer systems, water supply and purification, airports, and other transportation facilities, \$171,000,000; (e) flood control and other conservation, \$128,250,000; (f) white-collar projects, \$85,500,000; (g) women's projects, \$85,500,000; (h) miscellaneous work projects, \$71,250,000; (i) National Youth Administration, \$71,250,000; and (j) rural rehabilitation and relief to farmers, \$85,500,000: *Provided further*, That the amount specified for any of the foregoing classes may be increased by not to exceed 15 percent thereof by transfer of an amount or amounts from any other class or classes in order to effectuate the purposes of the foregoing appropriation.

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment. The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. WOODRUM: On page 22, line 8, after the word "appropriation", insert a colon and the following: "*Provided further*, That the lists of employable persons for work in the continental United States under the Works Progress Administration shall not knowingly contain the name of any alien illegally within the limits of the continental United States. It shall be the duty of the Works Progress Administrator or the United States Employment Service or both to make every reasonable effort, consistent with prompt employment of the destitute unemployed who are not of the class hereinbefore mentioned, to ascertain whether such lists contain the names of any such aliens and where disclosed they shall not be employed, and if employed and their status as such alien is disclosed, they shall thereupon be discharged."

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that this is clearly legislation on an appropriation bill. Further, it creates additional duties for the Executive.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Virginia desire to be heard?

Mr. WOODRUM. I submit the matter to the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York desire to be heard?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I submit the matter, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, I desire to be heard on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. GREEN. The amendment is clearly in order, because the Congress certainly has the power to direct in what manner an appropriation shall be paid. This amendment restricts its payment to American citizens unemployed. The purpose of the bill is for the relief of the unemployed. Surely it is germane and is in order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that before the Chair rules the amendment may again be read in a slow and distinct manner, so that every Member of the House can understand it.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will again read the amendment.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the amendment.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I wish to be heard briefly. I call attention especially to the language, "It shall be the duty of the Works Progress Administration." This language merely sets up additional duties to be performed by the Executive, and clearly is legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] makes a point of order against the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia. When the bill was called up in the House, unanimous consent was sought and obtained that all points of order against the bill and the legislation contained in the bill be waived. The pending amendment, however, includes the following language:

It shall be the duty of the Works Progress Administration or the United States Employment Service—

The Chair quotes so much of the paragraph under consideration as appears to the Chair to relate to the pending amendment—

to continue to provide relief, and work relief on useful projects, in the United States and its Territories and possessions, by the Works Progress Administration.

The pending amendment also refers to the United States Employment Service.

For the reason that the amendment includes another governmental agency, the Chair does not think the amendment germane, and therefore sustains the point of order.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TABER: On page 21, line 10, strike out the paragraph and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That for the purpose of providing direct relief in the United States, its Territories, and possessions, and the District of Columbia, there is hereby appropriated the sum of \$1,425,000,000; and there is hereby reappropriated for the same purpose all unobligated and unexpended balances with the exception of allotments to the Civilian Conservation Corps of the amounts appropriated by the acts approved June 16, 1933, February 15, 1934, June 14, 1934, and April 8, 1935, and to remain available until June 30, 1937, to be allocated and disbursed by the President to the States, Territories, and possessions, and the District of Columbia for relief according to their respective needs: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be allocated or paid to any State, Territory or possession, or the District of Columbia, or subdivision thereof, which shall not contribute an amount equal to at least 25 percent of the total proposed expenditures, both local and Federal, and shall not administer such activities by and through a nonpartisan board."

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment. There has been a good deal of confusion around my table and I was not able to hear it read. Does the gentleman have a copy of the amendment?

Mr. TABER. Yes; I sent it to the gentleman from Virginia.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, this bill as it stands is not a relief bill; it is a bill to continue the waste of the people's money through the W. P. A. and not meet the problems of relief, but to continue political jobs. It does not meet the problem of relief. If the funds that were appropriated for relief can be allocated and disbursed to the States by the President in accordance with their needs, the States, if they make a reasonable contribution toward those disbursements, will have incentive enough to see that these disbursements are made in an intelligent and economical manner and we shall begin to solve our relief problem.

Frankly, I do not believe we need to use as much money as is provided here for this purpose, but I feel that the majority of this House thinks so, and I want to put it on a basis that might start the country in the right direction. I am therefore to that extent surrendering my own ideas as to amount. I hope this amendment will be adopted and that we will start along in the right direction. I believe in relief, but I do not and cannot vote for ridiculous expenditures for ridiculous projects and for a waste of the money for political operations. I hope this amendment will be adopted. This amendment, if adopted, will make this a real relief bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Virginia insist upon his point of order?

Mr. WOODRUM. I do not care to insist on it, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York brings up the direct question of whether this Congress in its closing days is going to abandon all of the efforts at a recovery program insofar as it relates to work relief?

Are we going to withdraw all of that and undertake to set up some new system not described and not planned, but just anything that might be directly regarded as a repudiation of what has been done?

Mr. Chairman, for several days we have heard gentlemen on that side of the aisle get up and condemn the relief program, yet almost in the next breath they intimate they expect to vote for the bill.

Mr. TABER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. I did not make that statement. I said I would not vote for it.

Mr. WOODRUM. The gentleman said he would not, but many of his colleagues who found fault with it have said they would vote for it.

What does this mean? It means what a gentleman very wisely said the other day, and he was not a Member of the Congress. He said that no matter who does a job of this kind, there will be great mistakes made and great frailties in it. May I say that a gentleman is an optimist, indeed, who thinks if you take the administration of this fund away from the Federal Government and send it back to the 48 States that you will get the so-called politics out of it. You cannot do that. It can never be done. An editorial comment in one of the newspapers in the last day or two very wisely said that while there may be some merit in having State administration of relief, yet the sending back to the States for administration money that they had no responsibility for raising subjects the matter to greater abuses than exist under the present system.

No one claims the administration of this matter is perfect or approximates perfection, but it is a good, honest job, and nobody on the floor of the House has been able to point out where it has not been honestly administered. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, there is no use taking the time of the House or of the country in a further discussion of this matter. We have made our positions clear. The various Members have taken their positions, and they are going to have abundant opportunity to take a position on the record when the time comes for a final vote on this bill. I therefore hope that the amendment will be defeated.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TABER) there were ayes 33, noes 103.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment. The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. WOODRUM: On page 22, line 8, after the word "appropriation", insert a colon and the following proviso:

"Provided further, That the lists of employable persons for work in the continental United States, under the Works Progress Administration shall not knowingly contain the name of any alien illegally within the limits of the continental United States. It shall be the duty of the Works Progress Administrator to make every reasonable effort consistent with prompt employment of the destitute unemployed who are not of the class hereinbefore mentioned to ascertain whether such lists contain the names of any such aliens and where disclosed they shall not be employed, and if employed and their status as such alien is disclosed, they shall thereupon be discharged."

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I desire to make a point of order, but before giving the reason for the point of order I wish to propound a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Yesterday, when all points of order were waived, the points of order so waived were only to the bill; am I correct?

The CHAIRMAN. That is the understanding of the Chair, and the Chair will proceed upon such understanding.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order this is legislation upon an appropriation bill. Further, the words "it shall be the duty", and so forth, create additional duties for the Executive to perform, which in and of itself is legislation. It sets forth what the Executive shall do. Consequently, since we are creating new legislation by creating additional duties for the Executive, this is clearly legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. Chairman, for the reasons just stated I submit my point of order should be sustained.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Virginia desire to be heard?

Mr. WOODRUM. Yes. Of course, the provision in the bill providing for the Works Progress Administration is legislation. Points of order against that were waived.

This language merely relates directly to the duties of the Works Progress Administration and defines them. The Chair will observe the words "Federal Employment Service" which the Chair found objectionable in the other amendment have been stricken out.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, if I may reply, while the Chair sustained my point of order for a different reason the other time, that does not necessarily mean the Chair passed on all of the reasons that I advanced in my point of order to the gentleman's previous amendment. In this amendment there is clearly set forth legislation. We are setting up additional duties for the Works Progress Administration and this being an appropriation bill we cannot set up those duties because in doing so we are legislating.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, will the Chair hear me a moment?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule, but the Chair will hear the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON].

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Virginia would omit the word "knowingly" and if he would omit the latter part of the amendment, the rest of it would

be clearly impervious to a point of order and would accomplish exactly what he seeks to do. If the ruling of the Chair should be adverse, making it necessary, I hope the gentleman will omit those parts that may be held objectionable so that we may pass the proper part of the amendment.

Mr. WOODRUM. I may say to the gentleman from Texas that the gentleman from Virginia thinks the amendment is in proper shape now.

Mr. BLANTON. It may be, and I hope it is, and that the Chair will overrule the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. McCORMACK). The Chair is ready to rule.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO], makes the point of order that the proposed amendment is legislation on an appropriation bill. It is very clear and apparent to the Chair that under ordinary circumstances the statement of the gentleman would be convincing and binding. There is no question in the mind of the Chair but what it is legislation on an appropriation bill. However, this appropriation bill is somewhat different from other appropriation bills which are reported, in that all points of order against legislation reported out by the Committee on Appropriations have been waived. Certain legislation being in the bill and being properly before the committee with points of order against the same waived, it is proper to offer any amendment which is germane to the legislative features of the bill.

The bill provides "to continue to provide relief and work relief on useful projects, in the United States and its Territories and possessions by the Works Progress Administration."

It seems to the Chair that the Works Progress Administration could prescribe such a rule under the powers conferred upon it by the language of the bill. If this is so, it follows that the Committee of the Whole can prescribe what shall follow in the administration of the law with respect to the subject matter of the pending amendment.

The pending amendment is different from the one first proposed in that the pending amendment does not include another Government activity, but confines its operation entirely to the Works Progress Administration.

It appears to the Chair that the amendment in its present form is germane and the Chair therefore overrules the point of order.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MICHENER. Do I understand the Chair to hold that because all points of order are waived against all provisions in the bill that the bill, by reason of that fact, is not subject to the rules of the House as applied to ordinary appropriation bills?

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, I submit that is not a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. MICHENER. Then I do not know what you could ask the Chair that would be a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair realizes the parliamentary situation, but the gentleman's inquiry is such a natural and pertinent one to make that the Chair would be very pleased to answer it in order that there may not be any misunderstanding.

The Chair, of course, rules on each particular amendment as presented. The Chair is simply ruling on this amendment as it appears to the Chair. The Chair does not undertake to state just what the limits are as to amendments that may be offered and the Chair, naturally, would not make any statement that would preclude the Chair from considering each amendment on its merits.

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, in offering the pending amendment I want to give credit where I think credit is honestly and fairly due. The distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. BACON], a member of the committee, has been very much interested in this matter, and I think I do not violate any confidences of the committee when I say that in the committee the gentleman offered an amendment having for its fundamental purposes practically what is arrived at by the pending amendment.

I do not know whether it is the intention of the gentleman from New York to present his amendment in any other form or to discuss it, but if he does not I may say this about the amendment he probably would have offered if I had not offered this one.

There were two objections to the gentleman's amendment. First, that it was a limitation on all the appropriations in the bill. It did not apply to Work Progress Administration only, but applied to the entire bill, a very drastic provision that in the minds of many of the administrative officers would have set up at once an inquiry of every person employed under any appropriation in this entire bill, directly by the Government or by Government contractors, as to whether or not they were lawful American citizens.

Mr. BACON. Not lawful American citizens, because I did include aliens legally here.

Mr. WOODRUM. Yes; I accept the gentleman's correction. The amendment which has been offered goes as far, I believe, as you can go without setting up terrific administrative duties.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. WOODRUM. I yield.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Does the gentleman's amendment apply to all aliens?

Mr. WOODRUM. All aliens who are here now illegally.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. But that does not exclude from the provisions of his amendment those aliens who, while illegally in this country, are not subject to deportation?

Mr. WOODRUM. No.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. So such aliens are also deprived of the benefits under the bill?

Mr. WOODRUM. All aliens here illegally now are restricted merely from receiving work relief; that is, if there is one job to be given out and there are two men to get it, and one is an alien who is in the United States illegally and the other is an American citizen, the answer, I think, should be obvious.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. How does the gentleman propose to determine what aliens are here legally and what aliens are here illegally? There may be a registration of all aliens; is that correct?

Mr. WOODRUM. Not at all. This puts the duty on the administrative officers to exercise the best care they can consistent to determine who they are, consistent with prompt employment of the destitute unemployed.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Under that language the executive officer may prevent any alien from receiving relief.

Mr. BLANTON. Suppose he did, it would be good, sound legislation. [Applause.]

Mr. WOODRUM. We feel that the amendment is a wholesome amendment to this bill and its operation, and I hope the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. STUBBS. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following substitute for the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 22, line 8, insert after the word "appropriation" the following: "Provided, That no person shall be eligible for any benefit permitted under this appropriation who is not a citizen of the United States at the time of the approval of this act, or who does not possess a valid declaration of intention to become a citizen of the United States at the time of the approval of this act."

Mr. STUBBS. Mr. Chairman, I want to point out that the committee amendment does not go far enough. It does not reach to the bottom of this vital question. The committee amendment only forbids those who are illegally residents in this country from participating under the terms of this appropriation. This committee amendment is superfluous and unnecessary, because the law already provides that illegally entered aliens should be deported, whether they are public charges or not, and I suggest the enforcement of the law. If the alien is deportable, he should be deported until the law is changed.

I want to call attention to the fact that in the border States there is free ingress and egress between this country and Canada, Mexico, and the Latin American countries.

During the harvest season of crops in those border States these people come into this country and labor in competition with American citizens. After the crops are harvested they remain here and get on the relief rolls and remain on the relief rolls. They are perennial burdens on the relief rolls.

I am reliably informed that in one part of my district 40 percent of those on relief are aliens. They are not illegally here; they came here legally, but they have become a public burden.

Until we settle this question we are not going to settle the relief problem. We should cease providing for these aliens until we take care of our own people.

I know of no civilized country which would provide relief for aliens in the way that we are doing by giving them equal rights when they do not deserve it. The least an alien could do, if he is sincere, is apply for his first papers—which is all my substitute amendment requires.

Mr. DONDERO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STUBBS. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. How do these people come into the country, legally or illegally?

Mr. STUBBS. They come into this country legally.

Mr. DONDERO. But they remain here illegally after the work is done.

Mr. STUBBS. Not necessarily. For instance, under the present law, Mexicans and Canadians, in fact all people of the Western Hemisphere, can enter on a nonquota basis. This means that, provided they comply with the other provisions of the law, they are not subject to any limit in numbers. People of other hemispheres can only come here at the rate of so many each year, but the people of the Western Hemisphere can come in any number. They can stay for all of their lives if they so choose without taking one step toward becoming a citizen. Mexicans, for instance, come here in droves during the seasonal harvests, and after the work is done they simply go on relief. Because they have always been relief clients, they were not barred by rulings which decreed that applicants for relief would be eligible for relief provided they were on the relief rolls prior to May 1, 1935—or whatever the date was set around that time as the deadline. The W. P. A. had to set a deadline because there were too many applicants for the amount of money at hand, but the ruling barred many of our own citizens who spent their insurance money, sold their homes or other property, and hung on to their respectability as long as they could, and when they were forced to apply for relief, they found they had applied too late. It is a sad situation and needs correction.

Many worthy citizens of this country cannot participate under the terms of this proposed appropriation or under the current appropriation, because aliens are consuming a great part of our relief funds. It seems to me that the time has come when Congress should take notice of the alien question. I have one bill now pending before the Committee on Labor, dealing with the alien employment proposition, and that committee is kind enough to give me a hearing on the bill in a few days, but now is the time for us to stop feeding these aliens out of the moneys of the taxpayers of this country.

Almost every major nation of the world, except the United States, has laws or departmental regulations which give citizens preference over noncitizens in the matter of private and public works and in relief. Other nations, when they find a noncitizen on their dole or relief rolls, promptly ship the noncitizen back to his own country. They estimate, and correctly so, that it is cheaper to send a noncitizen back home than to support him for an indefinite period of time.

No one knows, apparently, how many aliens are on relief. Administrator Hopkins has conducted almost every type of census under the sun, but he consistently has declined to cooperate with me in the matter of determining how many aliens are on relief. Of course, it would be a big job to check the number of aliens on relief, but what of it—he is hard pressed to find jobs for white-collar people, and I believe

such an alien relief census would be helpful to those of us who make the laws. I have brought this subject to the attention of the W. P. A. on numerous occasions, and found little cooperation. I also have asked the Secretary of Commerce and the Secretary of Labor to cooperate in a move to determine how many aliens are holding jobs in private industry, but for some reason they view the suggestion with little interest. I am wondering if they realize that public opinion is being aroused to the point where wholesale deportations of aliens is being suggested in some quarters.

Recently, while testifying before a committee, the eminent and capable Daniel W. MacCormack, Commissioner of the Bureau of Immigration and Naturalization, pointed out that he has noted an increase of 66 percent in the number of aliens who have applied for their first papers and an increase of 33 percent in the number of those who have applied for their second or final papers. He ascribed this general rush to acquire citizenship to several reasons, most of them mercenary. He said that aliens are barred from city and State relief, and they want to participate—although the Federal Government does not bar them except in rare instances. He also pointed out that they are barred from some forms of public employment and that some private employers do not employ aliens who cannot show proof that they have applied for their first papers. Aliens also are barred from social-security benefits. Another reason for their flocking to become citizens lies in the fact that Congress recently reduced the naturalization fee from \$10 to \$5; and, he added for good measure, that aliens are becoming fearful of public opinion which might result in wholesale deportations. Commissioner MacCormack, in my opinion, properly classified these delinquent would-be citizens. The reason they want to become citizens is a mercenary one. Many of them, he said, lived here for many years and took no steps to become citizens until it appeared that their pocketbooks would be affected.

I certainly do not desire to deprive anyone of the opportunity to earn a livelihood nor to receive relief; but, when there are not enough jobs to go around or not enough relief money for all, I can see no reason why we should not give preference to those who are citizens or who have taken the first steps to become citizens.

I therefore ask that you accept my substitute amendment to protect the taxpayers and citizens of the United States from carrying the almost unbearable burden of relief—a burden heavily weighted with uninvited and unnecessary aliens.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Several Members rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will recognize for the next 10 minutes, unless the time is otherwise limited, two Members to speak in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] for 5 minutes.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I think we should consider this matter dispassionately and calmly. I believe we should not permit any feeling to enter into the matter. As a matter of fact our views on immigration may differ, but I submit that the proper place and time to consider restriction of immigration or dealing with aliens is in legislation coming from the Committee on Immigration, and such an important question should be settled only by orderly procedure. I am opposed to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia because it would leave all aliens on relief, subject to persecution by relief administrators. If the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. STUBBS] were adopted, hundreds of thousands, or maybe a few thousand—I do not know how many aliens—would be deprived of the benefits of the bill. What would then happen? You cannot deport them. You have no right to. They are not cattle. You cannot apply the same laws to private industry. You cannot legislate to compel private industry to exclude aliens, so that these relief workers who

are not citizens, thrown off the relief rolls, must accept work at any kind of wage, no matter how low, so that these aliens who are trying to become Americans, who are trying to live up to the American standard of living, will be forced to accept work at low wages in private industry. You are simply making more victims for exploiting employers. You are therefore creating more wage slaves.

Mr. FULLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. No. My time is limited. Further, why do you refuse to give aliens relief? These people are here legally; they are trying to become American citizens. Not only do you hurt him but how about his native-born children? They are American citizens. Starve the alien father and you starve his American children.

Mr. CURLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. No; not now, my time is limited. When you declared war you appealed to aliens and citizens alike to go to war to fight for the United States, and thousands and thousands of aliens went, many from my district, and yet you are now trying to deprive them of relief. No restriction was placed against them when you needed men to fight and die, they went to war, and I know the widows of many of those who went. Those widows today are aliens, and you are going to deprive them of relief?

Mr. DUNN of Mississippi. How about Grover Cleveland Bergdoll?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. He did not live in my district, and as a matter of fact Mr. Bergdoll was a wealthy citizen of this country, living in the city of Philadelphia. The aliens gave proof of their love for this country with their toil and with their blood.

Mr. DUNN of Mississippi. Yes; night before last on the flag pole in front of the Supreme Court Building.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. How does the gentleman know that it was an alien who did that?

Mr. Chairman, I submit that these ambiguous, veiled charges are most unfair. I do not think they are American. I do not think we are acting in the spirit of Americans. All of our ancestors were aliens. Would you have wanted this kind of an amendment to apply to them? Would you have wanted restrictions placed on your forefathers when they came to this country? My friends, these aliens are here legally. They are seeking to live peacefully, they are patriotic at heart, they love America, they want to build America. Give them a chance to live, do not force them to starve or work at starvation wages. Force them into sweatshops, make them wage slaves, throw them at the mercy of exploiters, and you will not only starve them, but you will thereby tear down the wage structure of even the American workers.

Mr. CURLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Yes.

Mr. CURLEY. Mr. Chairman, I represent a district adjoining the gentleman's district. I am speaking about the same sort of conditions that he has spoken about. I want to ask him whether or not this would affect aliens who had declared valid intention to become citizens.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Yes; this last amendment.

Mr. CURLEY. Not at all.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. The substitute amendment says "any person who is an alien as of the date of the enactment of this law."

Mr. CURLEY. Then I shall introduce an amendment to take care of that situation.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Why wait until then? It is now that we are dealing with this amendment. Why not defeat this amendment? Is the gentleman in favor of discriminating against aliens?

Mr. CURLEY. I will debate with the gentleman at that time about the conditions in his district and mine.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I shall debate the gentleman on this issue any time; even in his own district, too.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. BLANTON rose.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Texas rise?

Mr. BLANTON. I desire to speak in favor of the Stubbs' amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair cannot recognize the gentleman for that purpose at this time.

Is there any Member in opposition to either of these amendments who desires to be heard?

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Chairman, I am in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I oppose the amendment, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BOILEAU] is recognized for 5 minutes in opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me we should discuss this matter and decide upon it dispassionately, fairly, and justly. I have no selfish interest in trying to protect the rights of any aliens who may be in this country. There are no members of my family, as far as I know, who are aliens, in this country. My district does not contain any unusually large number of aliens. I have not been approached by anyone who opposes this type of legislation, but the matter appeals to me purely and simply from the standpoint of human justice. We in this country have, either through force and effect of our laws or through laxity in the enforcement of our laws, permitted aliens to enter and remain in this country. Whether or not those aliens are here legally or illegally does not alter the situation; does not change the fact that they are human beings, just as human as any man or woman upon this floor.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOILEAU. Not just now. If they are here illegally and subject to deportation under our laws they should be deported. If they are here in violation of our law they are subject to deportation; but are we going to deprive human beings who are here, whom we permit to stay here, and whom we do not force out of our country, of the only means they have of obtaining bread and meat? That is not human. That is not consistent with the basic principles of this country of ours. That does not seem to be the way our forefathers would have us, in this day, treat human beings who, for economic or other reasons, have chosen to come here. So long as we have permitted them to come here and permit them to remain here, we should not deprive them of the only opportunity they have to keep body and soul together.

Mr. WOOD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOILEAU. Not at this time.

There is no private or public agency other than W. P. A. that will give those people an opportunity to make a living. Who will take care of them? Shall they starve? Will we let them die for want of food? Is that the American way of handling the situation? If we do not want aliens in our country we should further restrict immigration and deport those who are here illegally, but if we do not exercise our right to keep aliens out of the country and to remove undesirable aliens, then we should not allow those human beings to starve.

Mr. WOOD. Will the gentleman yield now?

Mr. BOILEAU. I yield.

Mr. WOOD. Does the gentleman favor employing aliens who are here illegally in preference to citizens, when we know that there are yet millions of citizens who, as the gentleman says, are starving?

Mr. BOILEAU. I get the gentleman's point. I will say that we in this great deliberative body should not say that human beings who are in this country, either legally or illegally, should not have an opportunity to eat. If we need to appropriate more money, let us do so, but we should not take such an un-Christian and un-American attitude as is expressed by this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. BLANTON rose.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. BLANTON. There is pending an amendment and a substitute to the amendment. I move to strike out the last word of the substitute amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of the Woodrum amendment, if that is the best we can pass, but as a better proposition I am in favor first of the Stubbs substitute, because I think it is a better amendment than that offered by the gentleman from Virginia. I think the Woodrum amendment is somewhat complicated and may not prove to be very effective.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] is very much agitated and concerned about possible injustice in this bill to aliens. The question that most concerns me is justice to American citizens first. [Applause.]

The gentleman from New York said he was afraid that this amendment might cause a general registration of aliens. I only wish it would. I wish this Congress would wake up and pass a law—not years hence, but now—that would require every alien in the United States to register. [Applause.] Then we would put unlawful aliens out of here and give the jobs they are now holding to unemployed Americans.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] said that we could not prove that it was aliens who came here on these Capitol Grounds in the nighttime, and, as an affront to our Government and to show contempt for all law and order, raised the Communist red flag of Soviet Russia over the United States Supreme Court Building the other night. The proposition proves itself. Where is there an American who be so despicable as would do that? Is there an American who would raise the red Communist flag over his Supreme Court? If there is, we ought to hang him. [Applause.]

Oh, they say some funny Harvard University students did it. If they had been caught in the act, they would have been shot by the guard. If any Harvard University students did do it, I call on Harvard, a great university, not to rest or sleep until it finds out what infamous scoundrels perpetrated such an atrocious act, and expel them permanently from that university. Nothing less than that will clear the good name of Harvard University. And the student body ought to apply a wet rope to such culprits for 2 hours. They do not deserve to affiliate with a decent school in the United States, and an imperative duty rests upon Harvard University to properly punish them, and to purge itself of such Communists.

A MEMBER. Is not the Harvard flag crimson red?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; but it is of the honest and loyal kind, for the crimson red of Harvard does not carry any subversive sickle on its symbol; it is a proper, respectable crimson red.

I hope we will pass either the amendment or the substitute. [Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, I know the Members are interested in this subject, but they have expressed themselves on it pretty thoroughly.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM. I yield.

Mr. TABER. I would suggest that the gentleman modify his request to include substitutes and extend the time to 10 minutes.

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, I modify my request.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment, substitute amendments, and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia asks unanimous consent that debate on the pending amendment, substitute amendments, and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the pending amendment, substitute amendments, and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair suggests in view of the fact that debate is limited to 10 minutes that Members have as much consideration as possible for others who desire to speak.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words, and I am opposed to the amendment.

Mr. FULLER. Mr. Chairman, most of those Members who have been recognized have spoken in opposition to the amendment. I think the Chair should recognize somebody who is in favor of them.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair desires to recognize as many Members as possible and has tried to be as fair as possible in according recognition. Under the rules the Chair must alternate between those in favor of and those opposed to the amendment.

Mr. FULLER. I am for the amendment.

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Fifteen minutes have been utilized in favor of the amendment and 10 minutes in opposition to it.

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WOODRUM. I do not think the Chairman understood the gentleman from Texas to say he was seeking recognition in opposition to the substitute amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BUCHANAN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, if I can get through in less than 5 minutes, I will do so to give some other Member a chance.

Mr. Chairman, we do not want to go off half-cocked and bow to what we conceive to be a public or popular clamor. Let us sit here like men who give consideration to such legislation, figure out the results of the amendment and act in accordance with the dictates of reason. What is before us? The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] offered an amendment to exclude all aliens who are illegally in the country from any benefits under this bill. This covers the situation and is as far as we ought to go.

In the first place less than 4 percent of the unemployed are aliens, whether they are here legally or illegally.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. STUBBS] provides as follows:

No person shall be eligible for any benefit under this act who is not a citizen of the United States at the time this act is approved.

What is the effect of this? Every man now on the Works Progress rolls, or every man hereafter applying for work under this appropriation will have to be investigated as to citizenship, everyone. Think of it! The administrative expense will be terrific. The delay in getting people to work will be worse.

The second part of this amendment would exempt those who have declared their intention to become citizens.

Just think of the administrative cost. Between 2,000,000 and 2,500,000 people will have to be investigated as to citizenship.

Mr. FULLER. It does not say that.

Mr. BUCHANAN. It does.

Mr. FULLER. The amendment reads "those aliens who are not American citizens by naturalization or who have not filed a declaration of intention to become American citizens."

Mr. BUCHANAN. The amendment reads: "No person who is not a citizen at the time of the approval of this act."

Mr. FULLER. Or who has not filed his intention.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Wait a minute. Who is not a citizen of the United States; how are you going to find out about citizenship?

Mr. FULLER. Through his questionnaire, of course.

Mr. BUCHANAN. If you are going to take his questionnaire, why is it not provided in the amendment and stop

some of this expense of administration? Did the gentleman ever try to trace down the citizenship of some old fellow who came to his office and wanted to know whether or not he was a citizen?

Mr. FULLER. I certainly would know how to go about it.

Mr. BUCHANAN. In the case of many aliens they have been here many years yet they have married and have children. Their wives may be citizens and their children are citizens but they themselves are not. Just think of it! Oh, gentlemen, be reasonable! Stand up like men, face the music and vote for what is right in the administration of this question.

Mr. DUNN of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Briefly.

Mr. DUNN of Mississippi. The gentleman has read the first part of the amendment. Will he not now be good enough to read the last part of the amendment?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Yes. If a man, of course, has already taken out his first papers, declared his intention to become a citizen, it does not apply to him.

Mr. DUNN of Mississippi. It is in the amendment.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I know it is.

Mr. McFARLANE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. McFARLANE. Does the gentleman know of any country in the world outside of America that would put the burden on itself to feed other than its own citizens? The burden would be up to us to show that we were citizens of that country if we were going to be fed by it, and I think the same rule should be applied in the United States. I do not think we ought to feed aliens illegally in this country at all. I think we ought to cut them off the relief rolls.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Well, I do not cover so much territory.

Mr. McFARLANE. I do.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York, a member of the committee, for 3 minutes.

Mr. BACON. Mr. Chairman, I am only going to take 3 minutes because I spoke on this proposal this morning in general debate. I am in favor of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia because it is absolutely similar in purpose to the one I had intended to offer and which I did offer in committee.

There have been a lot of things said here that have nothing to do with the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia, which only applies to those aliens who are in this country illegally. Under our immigration laws those who came in illegally committed a felony when they came in, and that is all there is to the matter. This does not apply to the honest alien who is here legally with a valid document. Those we want to protect because they are potential American citizens, and that is the reason I am opposed to the substitute offered by the gentleman from California. I would not put a burden on those honest aliens who are here legally, and who are honestly trying to become American citizens.

Mr. Chairman, the substitute should be defeated, and the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia should be adopted. We do not want to replace American citizens on the relief rolls by illegal aliens who have under our own laws committed a felony when they entered the United States. They are subject to deportation and should be deported. [Applause.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, the pending amendments, both of which propose to favor American citizens over aliens in expending funds for relief, are of vital significance. Both the committee amendment offered by Mr. WOODRUM and the substitute offered by my good friend the able and distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. STUBBS] deal with the same subject. Either, in my judgment, will mean, if adopted, that at least 300,000 aliens, who are in this country illegally and who have no desire to become American citizens, but who are now on the relief rolls, will be taken off and replaced with 300,000 loyal but jobless American citizens.

Mr. Chairman, it is somewhat surprising to hear a Member of this body actually defend an alien who is here illegally and who has made no effort to ever become an American citizen. The gentleman from New York City [Mr. MARCANTONIO] appears to be very much exercised lest the Stubbs amendment or the amendment offered by the committee, if adopted, might cause a registration of all aliens in the United States. I wish it went that far, but I am sure it does not.

It is estimated that more than 5,000,000 aliens are now in the United States illegally. More than 300,000 of these have W. P. A. jobs that belong to loyal American citizens. Millions of others have jobs in private industry. These aliens ought to become American citizens or be deported. [Applause.]

May I add that I voted for a similar amendment when offered in the Appropriations Committee. I urged its adoption then. I urge the adoption of the Stubbs amendment now. It has real teeth in it. But if the Stubbs amendment should be defeated, then certainly there should be no objection to the amendment offered by the committee, which is a great step in the right direction. [Applause.]

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, the bill before us, H. R. 12624, designated as a deficiency appropriation bill, carries \$2,364,229,712.53. It covers money paid out and obligations incurred by various bureaus and departments without having been appropriated or authorized or directed by Congress, and to carry on various projects of the administration.

It is urged that this is necessary for the most part to take care of unemployment.

At the request of President Roosevelt, in June 1933 the Democrat "rubber stamp" Congress turned over to the President \$3,300,000,000, with almost unlimited authority to take care of unemployment and bring about prosperity. It was then urged by the New Dealers that this sum would wipe out unemployment and restore prosperity. It was claimed at that time that there were 10,000,000 unemployed persons in this country and that those needing relief numbered approximately ten to fifteen million persons.

In January 1935 President Roosevelt claimed that unemployment and need of relief were still with us and urged Congress to give to him, with dictatorial powers, an additional \$4,880,000,000 for unemployment and relief. We were assured by the Democratic leaders that this sum would certainly wipe out unemployment and restore prosperity and no further sum would be needed for these purposes.

To the amazement of the country, President Roosevelt recently sent a message to Congress in which he stated that there were approximately 5,300,000 families and unattached persons in need of some form of public relief. It is estimated that there are 4.3 persons to a relief family; therefore the President admitted that there are now over 20,000,000 persons needing relief.

Mr. Hopkins, the Relief Administrator, in his testimony this week before a congressional committee, claimed that there were more than 20,000,000 people in this country still needing relief.

William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, a good Democrat, issued a statement a few days ago in which he declared that there are over 12,000,000 unemployed workers in this country.

These three appropriations alone amount to more than ten and a half billion dollars. This is more than two and a half times the entire cost to this Government of fighting and winning the Civil War. Of course, this does not cover all that has been appropriated. The bill before us covers nearly two and a half billion dollars, but it is merely a deficiency bill. Our friend and colleague from Kentucky [Mr. MAY] in his speech to us a few minutes ago declared that the Seventy-fourth Congress, which began on January 3,

1935, has already appropriated and authorized the expenditure of more than \$20,000,000,000—five times as much as the cost of the 4 years of the great Civil War, and this sum has been appropriated and authorized in less than 17 months. Our colleague, Mr. MAY, calls to the attention of his Democratic colleagues and the country that this wild orgy of spending must cease or our Nation will be facing bankruptcy.

The Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Morgenthau, testified before a Senate committee the other day and pointed out that our Government was facing a deficit for the present fiscal year of approximately \$6,000,000,000, and more than likely there would be a deficit in the next 14 months of \$9,000,000,000. In other words, with the increase of a billion dollars annually of taxes under the Roosevelt administration, the Secretary of the Treasury asserts that under present plans of the administration our Government will expend within the next 14 months approximately \$9,000,000,000 more than its revenues. I think it can be said without fear of successful contradiction that the Roosevelt administration, when the 4 years are up, will show a deficit of at least \$16,000,000,000 and a national debt somewhere between thirty-five and forty billions of dollars. Many outstanding Democrats of the Nation as well as Republicans are becoming very much alarmed over this situation.

The New Deal administration justifies these extraordinary expenditures, deficits, and debts by saying that they were and are necessary to wipe out unemployment and restore prosperity. The question arises: Have the policies of the New Dealers accomplished either one of these purposes?

REPUBLICANS FAVOR NECESSARY AND ADEQUATE RELIEF

No Member of this House is more deeply or sincerely in favor of providing adequate relief for all of our citizens who need relief and cannot help themselves than I am. Every Republican in this House favors adequate relief for the needy. The Republicans do not object to the amount necessarily expended for the relief of the needy. We do strenuously object, however, to the manner in which relief has been handled and the New Deal proposes to handle it. We insist that the people of this Nation are entitled to have a dollar's worth of benefits for every dollar of tax money expended. The relief money should go to those who need relief. More than 300,000 new officeholders have been put on the backs of the American taxpayers, while unemployment has increased among the workers. This relief money has been used, however, to provide jobs for Democratic politicians and ward heelers. This administration, with the use of the relief money, has certainly cut down unemployment among the Democratic politicians. In some places authentic, authoritative reports indicate that more than 90 percent of the relief money has been used for so-called overhead expenses and only 10 percent disbursed to the needy.

This policy of using this relief money to build political machines, promote partisan politics, favoritism, and to club needy people into supporting candidates and a party against their will is one of the things condemned by the Republicans, by thousands of leading Democrats, and by the American people.

There are many items contained in this bill that are for worthy purposes and worthy causes. I certainly approve of the purposes for which much of this appropriation is intended.

POLITICS AND FAVORITISM

The Republican Party is doing everything humanly possible to amend this bill so as to divorce relief work and other relief from the blighting influence of partisan politics and favoritism. Mr. Hopkins was recently called before a committee of Congress, and, according to his own testimony, his relief organization throughout the Nation is honeycombed with fraud, favoritism, corruption, and politics. More than a thousand cases of fraud and theft have been uncovered by Federal agents, and there have been hundreds of convictions, according to the testimony of Mr. Hopkins. Political favoritism has raised its ugly head throughout the country. Relief money has been used to put on rackets, he admits. In

my own State, according to the leading Democratic newspaper, relief agents in one county got away with \$200,000. A large number of those charged with this fraud and graft have been indicted and convicted and given terms in the penitentiary. How many other counties in the United States have suffered likewise, nobody knows.

It is not necessary, however, for us to rely upon the testimony of Mr. Hopkins or Republican critics. Senator HOLT, Democrat of West Virginia, has in public addresses throughout West Virginia and in other places declared that the Relief Administration in West Virginia is reeking with fraud and politics. He cites many specific instances. He charges that the relief money is now being used in West Virginia to promote one Democratic faction against another Democratic faction. Similar statements have been made by the Democratic Governor of Colorado. Democratic Members of Congress have charged that in recent primaries the relief money was used against them and to support other Democratic candidates for Congress. In our election last year in Kentucky relief funds and other money appropriated for Federal projects were used to browbeat and intimidate the voters of Kentucky in aid of the Democratic candidates.

The Republican Party has just as much sympathy for the needy and is just as anxious that the hungry be fed and the needy be clothed and sheltered as any New Dealer. We do insist, however, that the money appropriated for relief go to those who need relief and not to a great army of New Deal politicians—that no partiality or favoritism be shown and that every needy American citizen be treated alike. We insist that if these policies were adhered to, the needy of this country could and would be cared for adequately and better than they have been, and that this would effect a saving to the taxpayers of from 25 to 50 percent.

PERMANENT AND NECESSARY PROJECTS

At the suggestion and invitation of the Government, last year the people in practically every county and various communities throughout the Nation submitted substantial projects for the purpose of putting in waterworks, sewer systems, building courthouses, municipal buildings, school buildings, streets, highways, and so forth. These were all needed, necessary, useful, and permanent public improvements. These projects were approved by the States and Federal Government, but so much of the \$3,300,000,000 and of the \$4,880,000,000 had been wasted on boondoggling and fantastic and useless schemes and projects that thousands of these real honest-to-goodness projects could not be built. Now, in preparing and submitting these permanent and necessary projects, the people of these various counties and communities consumed a great deal of valuable time and incurred a great deal of expense.

There is carried in this bill an item of \$1,425,000,000 for so-called work relief. Mr. Ickes, Secretary of the Department of the Interior, desired a lot of this money to be earmarked for these permanent, substantial, useful, and necessary public projects, and I am informed that about 160 Democratic Members of the House and many of the Republicans favor approximately \$700,000,000 of this money being earmarked for this purpose.

In my own congressional district, as in the congressional district of each and every Member, there are a great many of these permanent and useful projects, at Brodhead, Albany, Corbin, Pineville, Middlesboro, and other places, and there are such projects in practically every other county in Kentucky. I have been urged to favor the earmarking of this money, and I have pointed out to my constituents and to others throughout Kentucky that I strongly favored this program.

Let us not forget that we borrowed the money for this so-called work and direct relief and we are borrowing the money included in this bill for work relief. This debt, as well as the other billions of debts piled up by this administration, must be paid by our children and our children's children. May I appeal to the Democrats of this House that in the expenditure of this money it should be used for necessary and permanent improvements so that our children and our

children's children, who will have to pay these debts for the most part in taxes worked out and sweated out by them, may see some of the benefits that they are enjoying by reason of the expenditure of this money, and in that way create respect for us rather than contempt. If we waste this money on boondoggling and other wild schemes which will result in no benefit to our children and our children's children, how can they entertain for us anything except contempt for burdening them with these enormous debts?

Now Mr. Hopkins desires all of this money, \$1,425,000,000, turned over to him. He opposes its being earmarked. He is the fair-haired, spending, boondoggling boy of the administration. He never had any money or business of his own to spend and for that reason feels that he is peculiarly fitted to spend all these billions of the taxpayers' money. He is a real New Dealer. He favors "sock 'em with taxes" and turn all this money over to him without strings so that he may continue his policy of politics, favoritism, boondoggling, and partiality.

It is easy to see that if this \$1,425,000,000 is turned over to Mr. Hopkins without strings he can spend it where, when, and on whatever projects that might meet his fancy. The President and others of the high command of the New Deal who are "hell-bent" on reelecting Roosevelt have taken the side of Hopkins, and they are using clubs on the Democrats who favor the earmarking of this money and spending it in a legitimate, helpful way to the people of this country. We Republicans intend to do all we can to amend this bill so as to take favoritism and politics out of it and have this money spent in a way that will help the people the most and at the same time give more work relief than under the plan proposed by the President and Hopkins. I am afraid, however, that this Democratic "rubber stamp" Congress will let Mr. Hopkins have his way.

Before the A. A. A. and kindred agencies were knocked out by the Supreme Court there was a great shower of checks sent to beneficiaries just before election time. Mr. Roosevelt and others of the high command of the New Deal know that if Mr. Hopkins is given a free hand with this money he will be able, with the other money that is still in his hands, to employ, under some scheme or other, millions of people in September and October and up to and including election day in November 1936. This is a bold and daring plan to finance the Democrats' campaign this year out of the United States Treasury. Many Democrats in the House and Senate and thousands of patriotic Democrat leaders throughout the Nation, who love their country more than they do this New Deal party, realize that this is wrong and will hurt rather than help the country. It will do exactly in the future what it has done in the past—retard recovery, increase unemployment, and increase the relief rolls. Moreover, it will go far to break down the moral fiber of the people of this Nation. It will discourage honest enterprise, promote corrupt politics, encourage waste and extravagance as well as profligacy. The American people one of these days will rise up in their might and smite those who would wreck this country to further their own selfish political ambitions.

As further evidence of the purposes of the New Deal crowd, the Republicans have attempted to get through an amendment to have these projects on which public funds are to be used to be passed upon by a nonpartisan board and the funds disbursed by these boards and to make it unlawful for anyone connected with the expenditure of this money to intimidate or attempt to bribe any voter with relief funds or to force them to vote one way or the other for candidates for Presidential electors, Senators, and Representatives; but the New Deal crowd in the House objected to this, would not permit any such protection to be thrown around the people's money, or to protect needy people who must have these jobs from being harassed and threatened and forced to vote against their honest convictions.

KENTUCKY, \$369—NEVADA, \$3,077

As further evidence of the favoritism practiced by Hopkins and other New Dealers to whom has been turned over these billions of dollars by a "rubber stamp" Congress, I

invite you and the country to study the favoritism and partiality shown in the distribution of relief work and relief money among the States.

For instances, for the years 1933, 1934, and 1935, the Federal Government gave the average family in Nevada \$3,077, but the average family in Kentucky received in 1933, 1934, and 1935 from the Federal Government only \$369. In other words, the average family in Nevada received nearly nine times as much as the average family in Kentucky.

The average family in Nevada received the highest amount of any State in the Union, and Kentucky received the lowest.

The average family in Wyoming received for that period \$1,619. This is over four times as much as Kentucky. The average family in Montana received \$1,141 for that same period. The average family in New York received \$968—nearly three times as much as the average family in Kentucky.

Nevada is a rural State with no large cities. Kentucky has some large cities and a large number of industrial centers where there is a great deal of unemployment, in the coal mines, and so forth. Why should Kentucky families have received the least of any State in the Union?

It is made possible under this cruel and un-American system of placing these large sums of money with dictatorial powers into the hands of one man. The sky is the limit for him to play politics and show favoritism and partiality.

Only a few weeks ago I sent more than 7,000 questionnaires to the people of my congressional district seeking information and their opinion on various matters. These questionnaires were sent to all classes of citizens, many of them on relief. They were sent to at least 10 persons in each voting precinct. Among these was this question: "In your opinion, are the Government money and jobs being used for political purposes?"

I received more than 5,000 responses, and, with the exception of less than a dozen, they made positive answer, "Yes."

In looking over the daily statement of the Treasury of the United States on yesterday, May 7, 1936, I observed that the Government's receipts amounted to a little over \$10,000,000. Expenditures amounted to a little more than twenty-five millions. In this same questionnaire I asked these people if they favored a policy of continued deficits and debts, and without exception they answered "No." I also asked them if they favored Congress taking away from the Supreme Court the right to pass upon the constitutionality of the acts of Congress, and I was very much gratified that all answered positively in the negative, with the exception of some 10 or 12.

The people in my district favor, as I do, adequate relief for the needy, but they condemn, as I do, the attempt of the administration to play politics on the misery and distress of the American people and the waste of the public money; and likewise they condemn favoritism, partiality, and partisanship in the distribution of work-relief jobs and relief funds.

I hope that this measure may be so amended that those needing relief will receive it without regard to race, politics, creed, or color, and so that all American citizens who are in need may be treated alike.

THE GREAT PROBLEM—UNEMPLOYMENT

Although appropriations have grown larger and larger, and the deficits and national debt have increased by leaps and bounds, yet President Roosevelt; Mr. Hopkins, Relief Administrator; Miss Perkins, Secretary of Labor; and many other leading New Deal Democrats tell us that relief and unemployment are not temporary matters but are and will be permanent.

The question arises: Can the Nation continue long to expend billions of dollars more each year than it takes in its revenues, and borrow more and more money and at the same time see unemployment and relief rolls grow instead of diminish?

The reason advanced for the great deficits and increase in the national debt by the expenditure of these large sums of money was to cut out unemployment and relief. Undoubtedly there must be something wrong with the policies pursued, or unemployment and relief rolls would not increase.

We have seen the number on relief nearly doubled since June 1933 and the number of unemployed workers has increased from 10,000,000 to 12,625,000, although the administration some months ago removed from work relief and direct relief 1,500,000 unemployables in this country.

Who are the unemployables? Most of them are heads of families, and this means some four to five million people who have been taken off relief and cast back upon the States, counties, cities, and communities for help. They are the blind, the disabled, the aged, and infirm. In other words, they are people who cannot work. Was it not a cruel policy for the Federal Government to deny relief to the blind, the crippled, the disabled, and to the aged needy? Most of them have worn themselves out in helping to build up this country.

Many of us believe that there are some sane, sensible policies which, if adopted and carried through, would in a large measure solve the problem of unemployment and greatly reduce the tax burden of the people of this country.

FOREIGN IMMIGRATION—RECIPROCAL-TRADE AGREEMENTS

It is generally agreed, while no one knows and the administration refuses to take the necessary steps to find out, that there are at least 7,000,000 alien adults in this country, and that about half of these alien adults came into this country illegally. They slipped in or were smuggled into our country in violation of law. Every alien coming into this country illegally or smuggled into this country commits a felony. The number of aliens being smuggled into our country is increasing every day. In the last 10 years it is believed by those who have made a careful study of the question that at least 500,000 alien seamen have deserted their ships on arriving in American ports and are now scattered about over this country. At least 2,000,000 Mexicans have come into our country in the last few years under the guise of working on the sugar-beet farms and in sugar-beet institutions and to work in other capacities. A large majority has remained in this country and a large majority of them are now depending upon relief. Other millions have come in over the Mexican border, the Canadian border, and on the Atlantic and Pacific coasts.

Most of these aliens are heads of families. Millions of them, with their families, are now on some form of relief, either Federal or local.

I have no feeling against anyone because such person is an alien. Millions of these aliens have been here for many years and have enjoyed the blessings and opportunities of this country, but have never thought enough of your country and mine to become citizens.

But is it not your duty as well as mine as Members of Congress to take care of our own citizens, native born and naturalized?

PROVIDE FOR OUR OWN HOUSEHOLD

The Holy Bible declares that—

He that provideth not for his own household has denied the faith and is worse than an infidel.

Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, in order to carry out that policy for the United States I offer the following amendment to the bill:

No part of this appropriation shall be paid out on account of any wages, salaries, or other relief benefits to anyone who is not a citizen of the United States.

When Mr. Hopkins testified a few days ago before a congressional committee he stated that everybody was treated alike—citizens, aliens, aliens illegally entered, criminal aliens, and all. Our colleague, Mr. MARCANTONIO, of New York, urges that we should treat all alike, give the same character of treatment to aliens, whether they were smuggled into this country or are criminal aliens, the same as American citizens. He intimates that a Member of this House that would not subscribe to that doctrine was wanting in human kindness and Christian charity. I am sure that many other Members of this House, as well as myself, have as much of the milk of human kindness and Christian charity in our hearts as our colleague, Mr. MARCANTONIO. Does not the Holy Bible, as the guide of human conduct, urge that we

must provide first for our own household? I conceive it my sworn duty to first look after the welfare of the household of the United States. No head of a family can justify his conduct in permitting strangers to slip into his house and take away the beds and food from his own family. Our first duty is to our own citizens.

Aliens are not under the same obligations to this country as our citizens. When the clouds of war gather we can call our citizens to the defense of our flag and our country, but we cannot compel and have never compelled aliens to defend it. During the World War it is said there were approximately 1,000,000 able-bodied young men within the draft age of the allied countries living in our country. They were not citizens of this country. We could not force them into our Army and Navy because they were aliens. The allied countries that we were helping in the war could not force them into their armies and navies because they were not over there. I was not a Member of Congress, but I have wondered why the American Congress permitted these aliens to remain in this country and at the same time voted to send our own boys by the millions to European battlefields and to the seven seas of the world at \$1.10 per day to help save these allied countries. These same able-bodied young aliens, with other millions of aliens, remained in this country receiving on an average of approximately \$10 per day for work as wages, and, of course, many of those who engaged in business and other pursuits made much larger sums. When our boys came back home they found the jobs they had left in hundreds of thousands of instances taken over by aliens, and a lot of them still have those jobs.

I have heretofore pointed out that William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, reports there are over 12,000,000 unemployed workers in America, and President Roosevelt and Mr. Hopkins state there are over 20,000,000 people needing relief, and among these are 1,500,000 unemployables (made up of the halt, the blind, the lame, and the aged needy). The Federal Government is denying to this 1,500,000 unemployables any relief. Millions of these aliens have been supported by work relief and direct relief and, unless something is done, will be supported out of this work relief. We are not providing jobs or relief for all of our American citizens who need relief. The Federal Government is not providing any relief for these 1,500,000 unemployables, a very large majority of whom are American citizens.

Let us bear in mind that these foreign countries are not providing work relief or direct relief to American citizens, except it might be in rare cases. It matters not how skillful a mechanic may be or how proficient any other American citizen may be able to do certain work, the laws of France, Switzerland, Italy, and many other countries prohibit the employment of such American citizens if any citizen of that particular country can do the work and desires to work. In other words, the jobs must go to citizens of those countries first. Ours is the only country that has become the dumping ground and garbage can and Santa Claus of the world.

Before we have finished with the World War, it will cost this country over \$100,000,000,000. We loaned these foreign countries billions of dollars. They owe us \$12,000,000,000. All of these countries, with the exception of little Finland, refuse to pay any part of the principal or interest on these honest debts. These same countries are spending billions of dollars to increase their navies and armies, and thereby threatening the peace of the world and our own national security. Congress, last year and this year, has appropriated \$2,000,000,000 for national defense—the largest appropriations in peacetime in the history of this country. The administration claims this is necessary because of the large sums being expended by foreign governments in increasing their armies and navies. With all of these circumstances and facts before us, is there any good reason why this Nation should provide billions of relief for aliens who have never thought enough of this country to become citizens? If they desire the benefits of American citizenship they should become citizens, so that when war comes they could be called upon to defend the country that has fed and protected them.

This country should deport not only the smuggled in aliens, the criminal aliens, but all other aliens who are depending upon the United States Government for support. It would be much cheaper to furnish transportation to deport these aliens than it would to provide them support. If this should be done, it would reduce the number of our unemployed in this country by millions and, at the same time, reduce the number on Government relief by several millions. The President, Hopkins, and Miss Perkins say under the present set-up unemployment and relief is permanent. A great army of unemployed is a menace to any country. This is the real big American problem, and we must face it and solve it. Literally millions of the defenders of this country, and the sons and daughters of our defenders, are walking the streets and highways seeking employment that they cannot find. Many of them are in dire need but are too proud to accept relief from the country that they or their fathers protected and defended.

Can any Member of this House take the position that we must continue through the years to deny employment to our defenders and their sons and daughters and, at the same time, require the overburdened taxpayers of this country to support millions of aliens?

Our Democratic colleague from California has offered an amendment similar to mine, and I earnestly hope that his amendment, or my amendment, giving these relief-work jobs to American citizens will be adopted.

REYNOLDS-STARNES AND KERR-COOLIDGE BILLS

This administration, instead of trying to reduce the number of aliens in this country, has been driving with boot and spur to put through the obnoxious Kerr-Coolidge bill that will break down our immigration laws and increase the number of aliens in this country and at the same time thwart deportation of several thousand criminal aliens. I am pleased to see, however, the American Legion, the D. A. V., the D. A. R., the Junior Order of American Mechanics, and literally hundreds of other patriotic organizations in this country, both civil and military, fighting this administration Kerr-Coolidge bill. The American Federation of Labor and other labor organizations have also denounced its provisions, because they say it would tend to break down our immigration laws and increase foreign immigration.

The administration is backing the Kerr-Coolidge bill because it is so closely identified with the large alien groups in this country. They are afraid they might lose votes in the great alien centers in New York City, Chicago, Boston, and other big cities. These great veteran, military, and patriotic organizations are doing what they can to get through the Reynolds-Starnes bill. I strongly favor this measure. It provides that every alien in this country shall be registered and fingerprinted, and a lot of them deported, and cut down the quotas of immigrants at least 90 percent, and apply the quota restrictions to the countries of the Western Hemisphere as well as the other countries of the world.

We have pointed out there are millions of aliens in this country illegally. Among these are thousands of gangsters and criminals, like Hauptman, who murdered the Lindbergh child. He was smuggled into this country. They smuggle them in over the Mexican and Canadian borders and through our long coast lines on the Atlantic and Pacific. A few days ago the Governor of Colorado declared martial law on the Mexican border to keep his State from being filled up with Mexicans. Other States are threatening to do the same thing. The only way to find out the aliens that are in this country illegally is to require all aliens to register. This administration is spending millions of dollars on the boondoggling project of sending people around to find out if the houses on the various streets of our cities are properly numbered. That is a local matter for the officers and the people living in those cities. If the manner in which the houses are numbered suits the people in those cities, why should the taxpayers' money be spent on this useless thing? It would serve a good purpose if we would spend some money to find out where the aliens, the gangsters, and the smuggled aliens are and how many there are. It is high time that we set about to clean up our own country and put our own house in order.

It has been well said that if we do not Americanize the alien he will alienize America. If other countries will not employ American workmen and provide relief for millions of needy Americans, why should we provide work and relief for citizens of those countries? Let us send them back to their own countries and let those countries take care of their own citizens, and perhaps then they will not have the money to increase their armies and navies and threaten our own peace as well as the peace of the world.

RECIPROCAL-TRADE AGREEMENTS

Other Republicans and Democrats in this House, as well as myself, have heretofore pointed out the harm that has been done to this country by the so-called reciprocal-trade agreements that this administration has put through with a great many of the nations of the world. This administration has broken down our immigration laws. They have refused to protect American citizens from the influx of foreign immigration. They have tried to further break it down by the passage of the Kerr-Coolidge bill and have refused to pass that great patriotic American measure, the Reynolds-Starnes anti-immigration bill. We have pointed out how the administration could cut down the unemployment and relief rolls by millions if a good strong American policy was adopted.

These reciprocal-trade agreements have broken down our tariff walls and have turned over American markets to foreign farmers, industries, and workers. The increase in imports of corn from foreign countries in 1935 increased 2,500 percent over 1934, the importation of pork products increased 3,200 percent in 1935 over 1934, the importation of beef products increased 6,000 percent in 1935 over 1934. There was brought into this country in 1935, 276,324,000 pounds of hides, 256,525,000 pounds of tallow, 158,758,000 pounds of carpet wool, countless millions of pounds of butter, and millions of dozens of eggs, and everything else produced on the farm. Our export of cotton in 1935 was reduced more than half of what it was in 1932. We exported 95,000,000 more bushels of wheat in 1932 than we did in 1935. We exported 530,000,000 more pounds of animal products in 1932 than in 1935. We collected more than a billion dollars of processing taxes, and paid them out to people to destroy cattle, hogs, pigs, cotton, corn, wheat, and so forth, and took 40,000,000 acres of productive land out of production. This included 10,000,000 acres of cotton. This put 500,000 cotton farmers, mostly tenants, in the South on relief, and this cut-out took away the jobs of several million American farmers, farm tenants, and farm workers, and put millions on relief.

The truth is and the record shows that it would require 50,000,000 acres of productive American farm land to produce all of the farm products that have been shipped into this country under the New Deal and to replace the cut-down in our exports on account of the New Deal farm policies. If these policies should be cut out, it would reduce the unemployment and relief by many millions. Japan in 1934 shipped in a very small amount of textile goods. In 1935 it had jumped to 30,000,000 yards, and what has been said of textiles in Japan has been duplicated in various articles from the industries of the various countries of the world.

If we protect American labor from aliens and protect the American farmers and industries by cutting out the dumping of foreign goods and foreign products into this country, we will cut off other millions from the unemployed and relief rolls. I am unwilling to believe that this great, rich, wonderful country of ours must in the future have a great permanent army of millions of unemployed and a great permanent army of millions on relief rolls. It has been charged over and over on the floor of the House and Senate and elsewhere that it is believed this administration desires to keep this depression going and the people in need and distress until after the November election and under that pretext use these billions of dollars to coerce the needy American voters to continue in power for another 4 years this administration.

ENCOURAGE AGRICULTURE AND INDUSTRY

No nation has had prosperity with scarcity. Let us encourage our farmers to produce, at least enough to supply

the demands of our own country and protect our farmers from this enormous importation of farm products.

The Republican Party has always stood for high wages for our workers, high prices for our farmers, and a fair return for those who have their money invested in industry. If the farmers produce a surplus and the world market has a tendency to depress the price, let our country take care of that difference and uphold the price of farm products. This could be done with not more than \$200,000,000. As it is, we are spending billions on the farm problem, and the farmers of foreign countries are furnishing us our supplies and our farm workers out of work and on relief. Let us keep our farmers busy, and they will be able to buy the products of our factories, mines, shops, and mills. We should encourage American industries.

This administration appears to be obsessed with the idea we must destroy American industry. If our farmers were busy and industries were busy, we would find millions of jobs open for our people. Our people do not want relief, they want jobs, good wages, and an opportunity to earn an honest living for themselves and their families. Let us encourage thrift, self-reliance, and economy. With the attitude of the present administration the average person with a few dollars is afraid to invest it in any productive enterprise. Let the Government get out of private business. Let the Government spend its work-relief money on honest-to-goodness necessary, permanent public projects—highways, streets, courthouses, school buildings, and so forth, and pay honest-to-goodness wages for the service.

I favor another amendment to this bill, and that is, that the Government be required to pay the prevailing wages that are paid for similar services in the community in which the work or services are rendered. In some places in my district needy people are required to walk as far as 9 miles to some boondoggling job that paid but a little over \$1 per day, and then walk 9 miles back home. Eighteen miles is a very good day's work itself.

If sane policies had been adopted by this administration, we would have been out of the depression long ago. We honestly believe that the American people, when they have an opportunity, will elect a President and a Congress that stands for policies in this great rich country of ours that will reduce instead of increase the unemployment and relief rolls, and reduce instead of increase the great army of office-holders and the scores of bureaucratic agencies, that will reduce instead of increase the tax burden of the people, and that will cut out deficits, balance the Budget, and stop the growth of the national debt.

Mr. FULLER. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] will restrict only the criminal aliens and, in my opinion, will not apply to aliens generally who are on the relief rolls. The amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. STUBBS] as a substitute provides that aliens who have not become American citizens and who have not filed their intention of becoming American citizens shall not be eligible for relief. In my opinion, the Stubbs amendment should be adopted. The gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO], in opposing this amendment, says there are a great many aliens in this country who want to become American citizens. If that is true, why have not they qualified, or at least filed their intention to become citizens? Those who cannot qualify and have not attempted to qualify are certainly not entitled to any relief under this measure.

In my opinion, there is not a country in the world that would take the taxpayers' money and give it out as a dole for relief for Americans. I have heard this bill referred to by the gentleman from Virginia as an unemployment program. The truth of the matter is the main relief part of this bill carries a billion and a half dollars and is nothing more or less than a dole. It is relief for those who are in distress. It is high time that we should do something to protect Americans who are in distress. We realize that this appropriation is small in comparison to what those on the relief really need in order to make a decent living. We also realize that we have to anticipate that this program cannot be carried on indefinitely, and there must be a stopping point somewhere. Why

should we take American taxpayers' money, money out of the Federal Treasury, and use it for the purpose of feeding aliens who are in this country illegally? What we need is a rebirth and a realization that we should look after our home people first and more rigidly enforce our immigration laws. It is a well-known fact that the enforcement of immigration laws in this country in the past has been a joke.

I am convinced from arguments offered here on the floor of this House that there are many aliens in this country who are good citizens, some of whom have furnished soldiers for the World War, who cannot qualify on account of being unable to read or write. Meritorious cases should be carefully dealt with, but they are few in comparison with the wholesale unlawful entry of foreigners in this country.

It is claimed we have 10,000,000 unemployed in this country today. In my opinion, our labor condition in America is mostly caused from aliens performing tasks and labor which rightfully belongs to Americans. Even if these aliens are lawfully in this country, there is no reason why they should live at the expense of the Government, and, in my opinion, most of them could and would be taken care of by their relatives.

This is a question of policy, and the real question is, Shall we take our American people's money for relief dole for foreigners when we are not financially able to appropriate as much as we would desire to take care of the poor and distressed Americans in need?

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Chairman, it is difficult for me to understand how Members of Congress, whose constituency supported them and sent them here, made up of American citizens, can fail to support an amendment to a bill which provides simply that the benefits of the legislation shall go to American citizens. I am willing to go that far myself. Certainly no one can fail to support the committee amendment which simply says that those people who are not American citizens and who are here illegally cannot have any of this money that should go to American citizens. This money comes from American citizens and, therefore, I cannot for the life of me see why anyone could fail to support the Stubbs amendment in the first place, and if not that amendment the committee amendment. I heard only yesterday a statement made on the floor to the effect that probably the billion and a half dollars provided for in this bill will not be sufficient to take care of the unemployed of the United States. If it is not, every nickel of this money that is spent on an alien, to that extent you take relief and assistance away from destitute American citizens.

Mr. Chairman, I sincerely hope the House will adopt the Stubbs amendment, and if not that amendment, then the committee amendment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, let me submit to you as a practical proposition that Harry Hopkins was probably right when he said to the Committee on Appropriations that he could do little in this matter of discriminating against aliens on the W. P. A. rolls.

We may look at it in this way. If an illegal entrant into this country is single and unencumbered with a family, he will find a job and he will find some bread and beans somewhere without resorting to W. P. A. If, however, such an alien has a family consisting of an American wife and American children, what are you going to do about him? If, within the tenor of this amendment, you strike his name from the relief rolls, you have left a wife and her children, who are American citizens, high and dry and hungry. On the other hand, if you say to me that the wife can apply for relief, then I will say to you that you will have the spectacle of having stricken an alien from the rolls whose wife goes on in his place to get the same kind of relief, so that he will be eating the bitter bread of charity along with his family when he would rather work for it. What an anomalous situation this is, and I do not believe you are going to deal with it by any categorical legislation.

I am entirely in sympathy with the idea of giving preference to American citizens but, in practice, Mr. Hopkins ran into all kinds of difficulties and I concluded that he was

right, after I read the testimony last night. I think our futile efforts will come to naught.

There is a curious lot of confused thinking on this whole subject of aliens on relief and I trust that I can make several points clear.

As a general proposition, I heartily favor the idea of giving preference to citizens as against aliens. In general, I can agree that aliens are here by sufferance and that there is no obligation to provide relief or relief work for them at the expense of the taxpayers. It would therefore seem to be a simple thing to make them prove their citizenship and in the absence of proof, strike their names from the rolls of relief eligibles. What a pity that in practice it is not so simple.

The amendment pending before us is plausible enough and doubtless will be passed. Yet, if labor, if the veterans, if citizens generally could foresee all the implications of that amendment, they probably would be opposed to it in its present form.

First of all, it contains some political aspects. Do not forget that if you charge a relief supervisor with the responsibility of striking the names of aliens from the rolls, you also provide him with a weapon which in indiscriminate hands, could be an instrument of grave abuse. If the relief supervisor decided for political or personal reasons that he did not like the accent, the color of the hair, the slant of the nose, or the color of the skin of a relief applicant who was actually a citizen, he could cause so much trouble, so much inconvenience and so much delay by demanding undue proof of citizenship that the whole relief program purpose would be perverted or destroyed. The gains made by taking alleged aliens from the rolls would be offset by the trouble and distress caused to those who are not aliens but who might be politically persona non grata. In those areas peopled by folks of foreign extraction, the possibilities for abuse would be grave indeed.

Next comes an administrative difficulty. When you state in a legislative enactment that no part of the appropriation shall be used to provide relief for aliens, you place a personal responsibility upon supervisors, district directors, and others. If they make payment or provide relief work in violation of the statute, they become personally responsible. If they have any lingering doubts or suspicions about the citizenship of any relief worker, they would obviously hold up his pay, and the annoyance that can and will result will be tremendous.

Third, there are and have been so many loose statements bandied about this Chamber as to the number of aliens on relief that some of these indiscriminate remarks should be analyzed. Probably the most zealous crusader against aliens was Secretary Doak, who was Secretary of Labor under President Hoover. His zeal was so great that many people believed it to be a kind of persecution. It is not likely, therefore, that Secretary Doak would understate the case. Now, if you examine Senate Document No. 257, third session of the Seventy-first Congress, you will find a letter written by Secretary Doak to the Secretary of the United States Senate to the effect that in his opinion there were not to exceed 400,000 aliens here who were without proper certificates of arrival or registration cards and who could therefore be classified as illegal entrants. He estimated also that of that number, not to exceed 100,000 were deportable as being unlawfully here. If from that estimate there is deducted the number who have been deported since that time and the number who are self-sustaining, the problem of relief to aliens who are unlawfully here appears to be greatly magnified.

Fourth, the question of whether an alien is illegally in this country is always a matter of controversy. The immigration laws, for one thing, are rather confusing. Through the years they have been patched up with liberalizing or restricting amendments to the point where a vast amount of data and dates and laws and regulations must be examined before the matter can be determined. By the time that the status of many aliens alleged to be illegal entrants and on

relief is determined, the need for relief may be over. Meanwhile, they are subjected to the distress of hunger and suffering.

I subscribe to the general import of the amendment, but I fear that it was prepared without having in mind the many ramifications that are involved and trust that in conference at least, some provision can be made to prevent discrimination against dependent wives and children of aliens who are citizens of this country and as much entitled to relief sustenance as any other person.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to include therein some extracts from a statement before the Committee on Appropriations.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, I favor the Stubbs amendment. One of the most important problems facing the Congress today is the urgent necessity for the passage of legislation which will prevent the employment of aliens who entered America illegally. As long as we have American citizens who are unemployed and who are forced to ask the Federal Government and local agencies for relief, aliens who entered America illegally should not be employed, particularly by the Government. Neither should the Government uphold their illegal entry and illegal residence by granting such persons relief or loans.

I have introduced H. R. 12083, which prohibits such employment and the administering of such relief. It is estimated that we have now in America more than 16,000,000 persons of foreign birth, over 7,000,000 of whom are illegally in this country. This bill, H. R. 12083, would not only prevent the employment of these aliens but provides for their immediate deportation. If we have 10,000,000 people in America unemployed and almost 4,000,000 deportable aliens, it is obvious that if these aliens can be promptly deported, then the unemployment-relief problem in our country would become negligible.

I have also pending H. R. 7079, which would not only deport habitual aliens, habitual alien criminals, enemies of our Government, dope peddlers, alien smugglers, aliens carrying machine and sawed-off shotguns, as practically all racketeers and gangsters do, but it would further restrict immigration by reducing existing European quotas 75 percent and applying the quota system of restrictions to countries of this hemisphere, reserving 75 percent of those quotas for the very near relatives, such as aged parents and the like, of naturalized foreign-born and foreign-born residents lawfully in the United States able to support them.

Daily aliens are entering illegally. The Immigration Service reports a 50-percent increase in alien stowaways, deserting seamen, and the like over the previous year, and that alien smuggling is on the increase—boats, automobiles, and even a number of airplanes being apprehended smuggling aliens into our country. A current release of the Department of State on the immigration work of the Department calls attention to the startling facts that our consular offices report a waiting list of over a quarter million and that there are in 47 of the 68 European quota countries alone about 1,000,000 aliens desirous of coming to the United States.

The last census reveals a large number of foreign-born over 14,000,000; a large foreign-stock population, over 40,000,000; and aliens, over 6,000,000. What we need is an immigration holiday; and my bill's enactment would give it to us by reducing existing quotas 75 percent, reserving them practically for parents and other near relatives, and extending quota restrictions to countries of this hemisphere whose immigrants are not now numerically limited and which countries absolutely exclude our nationals from entry for permanent residence or to work. We have over 10,000,000 unemployed and do not need and ought not to have the hundreds of alien skilled and unskilled workers and job hunters that are entering our country. We have too many unemployed as it is, without importing another one. Not only have we too many unemployed, but we have too many applicants for relief, too many dependents, defectives, and delinquents

without allowing another one to be imported. Each country should care for its own unemployed and dependents. Charity should begin at home. Immigration should be further restricted and entirely suspended.

DEPORTS ALIENS

If enacted, the bill will not only really restrict immigration, but it will deport the three or four million aliens illegally and unlawfully in the country, and by so doing go a long way toward solving our unemployment and relief problems, because the bill expressly provides that all aliens must get naturalized forthwith or get out, and aliens illegally here cannot produce the necessary certificate of legal entry absolutely necessary for naturalization.

STOP IMMIGRATION ENTIRELY

I would go further than H. R. 7079 provides by the enactment of H. R. 11741, which I have introduced. This bill provides for the suspension of immigration of aliens into the country. In other words, under its provisions immigration would be stopped altogether. Our country would be far better off to stop absolutely immigration of foreigners into our country until we can Americanize foreigners who are now here. I introduced this bill and earnestly advocate its passage, but it appears that many of my colleagues feel that its provisions are too drastic. Surely such colleagues could not object to the provisions of H. R. 7079.

FINGERPRINT ALIENS

I would call your attention also to H. R. 11740, which I have introduced, and which is a bill to provide for the registration of aliens and a certificate of identification. I quote from this bill, as follows:

That every alien in the United States shall, within 3 months after the enactment of this act, apply to the Bureau of Naturalization for an identification certificate. Every alien, after the enactment of this act, before being admitted into the United States for temporary stay or permanent residence, shall apply for an identification certificate at the port of entry, and such application shall be a condition of admission.

Application for identification certificate shall be in duplicate and sworn to or affirmed by applicant. It shall state place and date of birth, sex, nationality, married or single, dependents, occupation, height, weight, fingerprints, and such other descriptive facts as may be required by the Secretary of Labor. A photograph shall be attached to each copy of application, and an additional photograph shall be furnished by applicant for certificate. Every alien under 18 years of age shall be registered by parent or guardian.

A certificate of identification upon proper application shall be issued to each alien who is above 18 years of age. It shall contain a photograph of alien furnished by him, signature, fingerprints, age, height, weight, and other apparent distinguishing characteristics of alien, with address which shall be on card of suitable size for carrying in pocket or purse. Every immigrant shall have his address entered upon his certificate within 3 months after entry by an officer authorized by the Secretary of Labor.

Sec. 2. Every alien shall, on demand, exhibit his certificate of identification to a representative of the Department of Labor and to any court of the United States, of any State, or subdivision of any State, or to any constable, sheriff, police officer, or other peace officer, local, State, or National. Refusal or failure of alien to produce and exhibit said certificate of identification shall be prima-facie evidence of illegal entry and such alien shall be deported.

If the Congress will pass this bill, our immigration and unemployment problems will both be settled favorably and permanently. It will cause the registration of every alien in the country and the immediate deportation of everyone who has entered illegally or who, although entered legally, commits any crime after his or her entrance into the United States. All lawfully entered aliens in our country who desire to become American citizens undoubtedly should have no objection to this registration.

I call the attention of my colleagues to these bills which I have introduced and which are now before the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, and urge your cooperation in my effort to obtain the passage of these bills before adjournment. The passage of either one of these bills will be a great step toward making and preserving America for Americans. My position on immigration matters is well known to my colleagues. Ever since I have been a Member of the House I have worked consistently for restriction of immigration and for the deportation of undesirable aliens. Since I have been a Member of the Congress, immigration

has been restricted by about 90 percent, but our laws, particularly deportation laws, are too lax and must be better enforced if we are to stamp out communism and other "isms" which are contrary to the principles upon which our Government is founded.

No legislation of greater importance to our country can claim our attention, and no other measure is quite as important as a relief measure. I urge your support and cooperation in the passage of this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I have already addressed the House once today urging legislation for the restriction of immigration, for the deportation of aliens, and to prevent Federal W. P. A. and relief agencies from giving loans, grants, and employment to illegal aliens. I called your attention to H. R. 7079, which I have pending and which would deport aliens; also, H. R. 11741, which would suspend all immigration; and H. R. 11740, which I have now pending and which would register, thumbprint, and identify aliens and compel them to carry their identifications with them or be deported. H. R. 12083, which I have introduced and which is now pending, will absolutely prohibit Federal agencies from giving relief and employment to aliens.

The amendment to the W. P. A., which is now before the House, will prevent giving relief and W. P. A. employment to aliens. It is not as far as I would go on this subject, but seems to be the best obtainable as an amendment to this relief bill; therefore I urge all friends of restricted immigration to vote for the amendment.

We have possibly 16,000,000 persons of foreign birth in our country and several millions of them here illegally. Also, hundreds of thousands of them have been getting W. P. A. employment and Federal relief. If you will adopt this amendment to prevent such Federal assistance in the future, you will go a long way toward relieving the unemployment of Americans in this country, and it will be one of the best votes you ever made in the interest of true Americanism, and I urge your vote for the amendment. [Applause.]

FLORIDA CANAL

Mr. Chairman and my colleagues, I can only briefly discuss the Florida canal because time is too limited today. I have heretofore on a number of occasions discussed the project at length before the House and also the Appropriations Committee. I would particularly call your attention to the fact that 2 days ago the House voted by a vote of 210 to 84 to approve three projects which bear the same legislative history as the Florida Canal. I have reference to the projects in West Virginia, Mississippi, and New Mexico. These three projects, together with the Florida Canal and Passamaquoddy, were several weeks ago recommended by the Bureau of the Budget and certified to the House Committee on Appropriations for inclusion in the War Department appropriation bill. They carried a total item of \$29,000,000. The House Appropriations Committee declined to include them in the War Department bill. The bill was sent to the Senate. The Senate did not include the Florida Canal and the Passamaquoddy projects but did include the other three projects.

None of the five projects were authorized directly by a special act of Congress, but were all begun by President Roosevelt under the general authority given him in the work-relief bill passed the last session of Congress, and which carried an appropriation of \$4,800,000,000. Parliamentary and legal authority hold that the Florida Canal is in fact authorized. He began all five of these projects in good faith and according to authority given him by the Congress. Now, the House and Senate have both approved appropriation for these three projects above referred to, and it is the duty of the Congress likewise to appropriate for the Florida Canal project. It is undoubtedly of far greater general importance than either of the five projects. It is giving more employment directly and indirectly than either of the five. It is the only one of the five which will carry permanent benefits in the future to practically every State in the Union.

The Florida canal when completed will save in operating costs of ships \$8,000,000 annually. It will save to shippers of America in transportation charges over \$30,000,000 annually. It will handle one and one-half times the tonnage which now

transits the Panama Canal. It will eliminate existing storm hazards incurred by ships passing around the Florida Peninsula. It will be a great asset to our national defense. It will save 700 or 800 miles shipping distance between New York and New Orleans.

The Chief of the Army Engineers, after a thorough survey, has concluded that no serious damage will be done to Florida's underground water supply or to Florida's fruit and vegetable growth. After thorough study the Chief of the Army Engineers and other eminent engineers and engineering boards have concluded that it is economically sound, is justifiable as a river and harbor project, and is in the public interest. We are spending billions of dollars for unemployment relief and for public improvements. Thousands of the projects upon which work has been done are of far less general importance and general benefit than the Florida Canal. In fact, this project is the banner project, and will ultimately stand out as a lasting monument of real achievement and public improvement of President Roosevelt's administration. I cannot see how any Member of the House can conscientiously object to applying funds for the completion of this project. Federal funds cannot be expended on any projects quite so meritorious as this one. It is the duty of our administration to complete the project, and I cannot believe that in duty you will fail.

I include herewith a portion of a statement which I made before the House Appropriations Committee on April 10, 1936:

Mr. GREEN. The Board of Engineers, which was appointed by the President and a special board to iron out any differences which might exist between the Public Works engineers' report and the Army Engineers' tentative report, made an exhaustive study of the project, and recommended that it was sound; that it could be built; and that it would return more than 6-percent interest on the investment in actual saving in the operation of ships. They recommended that it could be, and should be, constructed and that it was in the public interest. The way they scaled it was this: They figured that it would require \$143,000,000 to construct it, and they figured that it would save to shipping, or in the actual operation of ships, approximately \$8,000,000 a year, or a little more than that. But say a saving of \$8,000,000 a year, and that would be a return of about 6 percent on the investment. The standard yardstick for the majority of river and harbor projects is about 4-percent return, so that the return on this investment would be 33 1/3 percent greater than the usual standard set for river and harbor projects. So far as the percentage of saving is concerned, it is probably better than any project the Army Engineers have ever reported.

AUTHORITY AND ESTIMATES FOR THE CANAL

Mr. TABER. There are two questions I would like to hear you discuss: In the first place, is there a Budget estimate for this?

Mr. GREEN. Yes; there is a Budget estimate. The Bureau of the Budget has recently favorably recommended \$12,000,000 appropriations by your committee to continue work this year.

Mr. TABER. In the second place, is it authorized by law, and, if not, why do you not go to the committee that would have authority to report such a bill?

Mr. GREEN. The Bureau of the Budget recommended to the Appropriations Committee of the House that funds be appropriated by this Congress in the amount of \$12,000,000 for the continuation of this project; so I consider that as a Budget approval. As for authorization by Congress, it was one of those projects that the Engineers had agreed upon. They determined the feasibility of it and the desirability of it and the economic soundness of the project. By that I mean the Army Engineers, or the Chief of Army Engineers. The board had never made a full report on it, and pending that report Congress passed the emergency relief bill last year, and in that bill they gave the President authority and direction, or, as I see it, an order to use this money for the relief of unemployment in America, and to embark upon such projects as he deemed to be in the public interest. Regarding it as a mandate, and it was a mandate, this was one of the projects he embarked upon.

He began work on the canal last September and allocated to it from W. P. A. funds \$5,000,000. Since that time another five or six hundred thousand dollars have likewise been allocated. He put it in charge of the Board of Army Engineers, and they have it now under actual construction, with about 6,500 men employed. This project has taken up the main portion of the unemployed in my State. They are getting more value in that respect than they could have received under any other plan, because they are paying P. W. A. wages. They are paying unskilled workmen, who are working on the project, I understand, \$26 per month, and, in addition thereto, they give them bed and possibly food. I believe they get food.

Mr. TABER. That is more than the going wage in that locality?

Mr. GREEN. I believe in this locality in Florida is paid from \$1 to \$1.50 per day. That is for common labor.

Mr. TABER. They do not work every day for W. P. A.

Mr. GREEN. I think they pay for 5 days per week on the canal; so they are complying with the usual prevailing rate in that locality.

Mr. TABER. The usual rate is \$1 for a 10-hour day.

Mr. GREEN. It is \$1 to \$1.50 for an 8-hour day. That is what we usually pay. They are making unusual strides on this work.

Now, as to whether or not Congress has approved it is a question for each one to decide for himself. I say that it has approved it, because it was approved in the general works bill that passed with the authorization of \$4,800,000,000, and the President began it under this express authorization and direction.

The Chief of the Army Engineers has approved it; the Public Works engineers have approved it; the special board of review appointed by the President approved it. This board consisted of two Army engineers, two P. W. A. engineers, and one engineer from civilian life, and it has had every approval except the direct passage of a bill by Congress, the naming of the project.

BENEFITS TO BE DERIVED FROM THE CANAL

There is one thing, gentlemen, that I would like for you particularly to bear in mind.

This project is of general benefit. Thirty-nine States in the Union are directly interested in it. It will save to the shipping public in transportation costs \$30,000,000 to \$32,000,000 a year. Those figures have been given by the Department of Commerce under Secretary Roper. That does not mean the cost of operating the ships; that is eight million and something. It will save the Government in mail contracts alone \$800,000 a year. It will save in distance time almost 3 days round trip in traveling from the east coast of the United States—Philadelphia, for example—to New Orleans. That saving is enormous. It has been estimated—not by me, but by commerce experts; the Department of Commerce and the Board of Army Engineers made this estimate—that one and one-half times the tonnage which now goes through the Panama Canal each year will pass through this canal. This tonnage will be procured from all the States of the Mississippi Valley, and the tonnage going the other way will be procured from all the East Coast States and foreign countries. Ports like Philadelphia and New York will experience a decided increase in their water-borne tonnage. Every State in the Union, practically, will share in the benefits in producing the material that goes into construction.

Men today, not only from Florida but from practically every State in the Union—I am referring to skilled labor—are now working on this canal. They are taking them from the civil-service rolls—all skilled laborers and office personnel—and they are drawn from all over the United States. The steel that goes into the dredges—and they now have a large number of dredges operating there—comes from the iron-producing sections of our country; cement likewise, and all of the material.

Now, then, I say the Congress is morally bound to carry on this project. My people a year ago—a little less than a year ago—when the project was ready to be initiated, bonded themselves for a million and a half dollars to purchase the right-of-way. That bond has been voted by a vote of 27 to 1. A large block of the bonds has been sold; the money has been exchanged and paid for the deeds to the land, the right-of-way, and that has been turned over to the Federal Government.

That was one of the stipulations made to the President—an oral stipulation; do not misunderstand; an oral stipulation—that I, for one, promised the President would be carried out if he would embark upon the construction of this canal; that Florida would furnish the right-of-way. Our people have done this now, and this Government, by this act of the Chief Executive beginning construction on the project, is morally bound to my people to complete it. We have done all that they have asked us to do.

ARGUMENTS IN OPPOSITION TO CANAL

Now, there has been in the State a little opposition to this canal. There has been some propaganda sent out to the effect that this canal, if constructed, will have a detrimental effect upon the water supply and upon the vegetation of that area south of the canal. The Board of Army Engineers, through the Chief of Engineers—and I will put that in the record—concludes that he has examined it and that no adverse effects will accrue therefrom. No board of engineers, no engineer, that has made a careful survey, says that it will have any serious adverse effect.

There are 30,000 lakes in the State of Florida. This canal route has two large rivers, one from either direction—one from the Atlantic and one from the Gulf—feeding this canal and beginning and ending it. The engineers have estimated and found that there is a sufficient volume of water which will flow into the canal from the midsection of it so that there will be a continuous current to the Atlantic and a continuous current to the Gulf of Mexico of fresh water, and that the salt water, in fact, will never get to the interior parts of the State in this canal. Therefore, if the salt water cannot get there, the underground fresh water could not be contaminated. But even granting that the salt water could get there, the engineers have found that where salt-water streams impregnate our State, all along by those salt-water streams, fresh-water springs are found. Orange groves and groves of other trees and general vegetables grow on the very bank of the salt-water stream, out from St. Augustine some 3 miles; in the Atlantic Ocean there is a huge spring that yields so much fresh water, away out in the ocean, that the shrimping boats, instead of going to St. Augustine to refill with water, go to this spring, throw out their buckets, fill up their tanks, and other receptacles, and go back to fishing, and do not go ashore for days. You can go anywhere, almost on the edge of the Florida salt water, the edge of the coast, bore down a few feet, and get a fresh-water—sometimes artesian water.

The engineers claim—and they know; and if they do not, common sense would lead us to know—that if this canal would contaminate the spring water and the underground streams in our State, the salt water adjacent to the shores of Florida—and it is enveloped all the way around by salt water; you cannot get more than 50 or 60 miles from salt water in Florida—if that should obtain, every foot of Florida land today would be spoiled by salt seepage from the ocean.

So that is a smoke screen put out by the opposition. The opposition to this canal is the usual opposition to practically all water improvements. It is the railroad opposition. They fear that they may haul less tonnage and that the transportation rate charge may be reduced. My contention is that the transportation charge will be reduced, but the tonnage hauled by the railroads will be so greatly increased that the railroads will produce more revenue every year after the canal is constructed than they are producing today—every railroad going into that territory. These common carriers will thus be enabled to employ more people and also pay greater dividends on their investments.

So the argument relative to contamination of water and our vegetation has been disproven, and is absolutely without foundation, according to the superior engineering figures and conclusions in the matter. If we cannot trust the Chief of Engineers of the Army, after he has carefully examined the project—and he has; he has appointed a special committee of his engineers to examine it and to determine these questions—I do not know whom we could trust. That is the highest authority we have, and they say that it will not contaminate the water and the vegetation will not be seriously affected.

I do not believe that 2 percent of the people of Florida oppose this canal. There was some opposition in Tampa to it, and I find in my records here a letter from Tampa, from the chamber of commerce or some organization there, indicating that if they could get the canal routed through Tampa they were for the Florida canal. They did not get the route through Tampa, and in that part of the State of Florida a few of them are opposing the canal—very few. There is always a certain rivalry and jealousy in every State relative to where a great improvement or a great project shall be located. So that minor rivalry has existed in our State.

There is also a slight opposition from a few shipowners; not those who operate their own ships but the shipowner who sublets his ship to another man and reaps his pay for that ship by the number of miles that the ship makes. He leases his ship out; that ship goes all the way around the Florida Peninsula and does that extra 3 days' time and mileage in going to New Orleans and back. Naturally he would get more mileage for his ship, having made this trip, and that man naturally would be against shortening of the distance of transportation from New York City, we will say, to New Orleans. That is only to be expected. However, the man that operates his ship himself naturally wants to see this saving in coal, this saving in operating expense, and this shortened mileage obtained.

UTILIZATION OF CANAL

So when this canal is opened I believe that 99 percent of the shipping interests that now ply the lower Atlantic and the Gulf of Mexico will utilize this canal. It has been estimated by careful surveys—surveys by the Department of Commerce and specially employed engineers—that 10,000 ships per year will go through the canal carrying the usual tonnage carried by boats in the Gulf of Mexico and the lower Atlantic. You can very well see that within 32 years the canal would liquidate its cost of construction, at a 4-percent bond, and pay for the cost of operation.

Another great reason why it should be completed is because of the storms that boats run into in going around the peninsula of Florida. We had last year some disasters down there from storms. The boats will cut through this canal and absolutely eliminate any serious danger from storms. The storm insurance to the boat owner will be lessened. His premium will be smaller; casualties will be practically eliminated, and citizens traveling from every State in the Union will be benefited and protected by it.

Another thing: Suppose you wanted to empty your fighting craft from the Atlantic to the Gulf of Mexico, or vice versa, in time of war. The next trouble we have that is serious is going to come from south of us. You have got here an outlet that will put every one of your fighting vessels from the Atlantic to the Gulf of Mexico, or vice versa, in only a few hours. You have there a defense that cannot be paralleled anywhere else in the United States. If this canal is completed—and it will be—your Navy will forever be secure. It could never be captured. Our Navy sometime may have to retreat into the Gulf of Mexico from the Pacific Ocean through the Panama Canal or from the Atlantic Ocean through the Florida canal. You have enough natural resources to feed your Navy and to feed your people in the Mississippi Valley and to maintain and rebuild your Navy there. As a national-defense feature alone it warrants a \$143,000,000 expenditure. It will not require that much. They have already spent about five and one-half million on it. It probably will be completed for \$125,000,000.

Now, gentlemen, when we are spending these moneys as we have been—and I feel gravely the responsibility of it, the indebtedness that we are incurring as an absolute condition of necessity, brought on by conditions that this present administration inherited—as we are spending these moneys, undoubtedly they should be spent on projects which are of lasting improvement to the American people. And this one is a lasting improvement to the American people. Eighty percent of the money that has gone in the project and will go to complete this canal goes directly and indirectly into the hands of labor.

I do not see what better project could be developed. The Chief of Engineers of the Army has repeatedly told me that as a straight Army engineering project alone, as a river and harbor project alone, it justifies an expenditure of over \$100,000,000. If we are going to develop our national waterways, why not put this main link in there that will link up the Gulf commerce with the Atlantic commerce, and thereby enhance the value of every dollar we have expended in the Mississippi Valley and on the Atlantic coast?

We have developed an intercoastal waterway from Boston to Jacksonville, Fla., and we have jumped right across and on the other side of Florida we have developed it on to the Rio Grande. Now, why not put in this further link there? I cannot believe that this committee will permit the matter to be tied up here, and the money that you have already put in thrown away.

Do you think Congress is going to appropriate money to fill up that 16-mile ditch that the Army engineers have dug there? The Army engineers have a canal there today approximately 16 miles long and 30 feet deep. You can land an airplane in it, and it is the best landing field you ever saw—the bottom of that canal. They have it in some places down almost to sea level. Now, then, are we going to be an unwise Congress and go there and fill up the hole that we have already dug, or are we going to do what the engineers say is prudent, what the Department of Commerce says is prudent, and what the shipping companies that are not selfish say is prudent, and go on and complete it? Are we going to help the east coast of the United States all the way down from Boston by completing a project that is really worth something, or are we going to abandon it, blow off the hounds, and quit the drive, and say that we will boondoggle around and throw the taxpayers' money away on projects of little or no permanent benefit? It is a grave responsibility that the Congress has in this matter. It is a project that the American people practically everywhere want. Every water organization in the United States has endorsed it and passed resolutions for it. Every engineering authority that has examined it has approved it. And yet there is some hedging around because Congress has not directly passed a bill for it. We must not hide behind technicalities to try to defeat this, the banner project of the New Deal.

In the former committee, the subcommittee on the Army bill, they did not turn down this project in actuality. It is true they declined to include it, but the report transmitting the bill to the Congress cited that the item could be taken care of in the deficiency bill. But the matter that I am trying to bring to the attention of the committee is this: If your deficiency bill contains your W. P. A. funds, there is ample room for this canal appropriation therein. A clause can be put in directing that this project be carried on in your recommendation to Congress; and I do not believe this committee would want to see five and one-half million dollars spent on a project like this, that is of national interest and national importance, not only to us but to the American people for all time, and then have it abandoned. It cannot be abandoned.

The reason Europe today has economy in transportation, gentlemen—and you have studied the figures, I know—is because she has developed her waterways. According to her area of land, she has developed her waterways a number of times, probably six or seven times, more than the American people have. But we have now got to come to waterway development. Our volume of commerce demands it. More commerce is hauled every year than was hauled the previous year. The building of this canal is not going to lessen your transportation by bus or your transportation by rail. It is going to increase it, because it will increase the general volume of commerce.

Take this example, for instance, if you will—and this is something that all you gentlemen are interested in. Your constituents ship apples; they ship cotton; they ship vegetables. In Florida we have to pay, we will say, 80 or 90 cents to ship a crate of vegetables to the East. That crate of vegetables has got to bring that 80 or 90 cents plus the commission cost and enough to put it in the crate. When it ceases to do that, the grower ceases to ship it. If that could be transported there for 30 or 40 cents, that other 50 cents would enable the grower to market half of the crop now that decays in the field.

Not long ago I passed through a tomato field in Florida, and I saw the alleys filled with edible tomatoes that should have been canned or should have been shipped. I inquired why. They said, "We pay a dollar express on them. We cannot get this for them." This Florida canal, when constructed, could put them in New York for probably 30 cents.

I went on to a little town 3 miles farther and ate tomatoes that were canned in Italy.

Now, gentlemen, it is our duty to develop our waterways. With the opening of this Florida canal, Florida tomatoes and Florida oranges that are now rotting in the fields and on the trees will be transported to the eastern market at a price at which they can afford to eat them. It is a matter of volume. They will transport three crates where they transport one crate now, and for those three crates they will get about \$1.20 or \$1.50 to transport it, and for one crate they get about 90 cents now. Over half of the States in the Union will share in these benefits accruing from this canal.

It is obvious that it is in the public interest and for the public welfare to go on with a project like this.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I would love to talk more, but I will not bore you too much with it. I know you have been liberal, and I appreciate it, and if I may have permission to extend my remarks, I may put in one or two brief items of interest. The same arguments that obtain against this project obtained against the

Panama Canal, and today the tolls on that Canal bring from twenty to twenty-eight million dollars into the Federal Treasury a year. We do not want a toll canal across Florida, but if by chance tolls should be charged, this canal will pay for itself, and pay 4-percent interest, in 32 years.

Our duty in this matter, as I see it, is obvious. It is clear to me. It will enhance the value of your Panama Canal and its usefulness; and I hope your committee will provide funds that will be used for work on this project for the next 12 months.

The CHAIRMAN. You may have permission to revise and extend your remarks.

Mr. GREEN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman; and I appreciate your letting me come before you. I hope that the committee will consider it that way and not permit technicalities or minor things to stand in the way of the completion of a project that will stand out as the principal achievement in the way of public construction benefit of the first half of this century. Each generation in the future will reap benefits most justifiable.

I thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will report the committee amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia and the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from California.

The Clerk again reported the Woodrum amendment and the substitute amendment.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. TARVER. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Woodrum] has been referred to by the Chair as a committee amendment. I wish to inquire what it takes to constitute a committee amendment. This amendment has never been submitted to the committee, and, so far as I know, is the handiwork of the gentleman from Virginia.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair does not consider that a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I respectfully insist, in all seriousness, that the inquiry is made in good faith and affects parliamentary procedure and should receive courteous consideration by the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. While the Chair does not consider that a parliamentary inquiry, having reference to the actions of a committee—

Mr. TARVER. The question is simply whether the Chair is correct or not.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will suspend until the Chair completes his statement.

Proceedings in committee are something about which the Chair has no knowledge. However, the Chair will ask the gentleman from Virginia whether the amendment is a committee amendment or an amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Woodrum] offers the amendment, and it is offered with my approval. The gentleman from Virginia did not put anything on the amendment that stated it was a committee amendment. Because the amendment comes from a member of the committee, the Clerk simply read it as a committee amendment. It was not offered by us as a committee amendment, but it is approved by both of us.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from California to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia.

The question was taken; and there were on a division (demanded by Mr. McFARLANE and Mr. FULLER)—ayes 45, noes 93.

So the substitute amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Woodrum].

The question was taken; and there were on a division (demanded by Mr. BOILEAU)—ayes 136, noes 19.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BACON. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Bacon: Page 21, line 12, after the word "Administration", strike out the comma and insert in lieu thereof the following: "cooperatively under State and local nonpartisan boards to be appointed by the Governor of, or, as

may be determined by each State and Territory, and the personnel thereof to be composed of citizens of the United States residing in the respective areas of administration."

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order.

Mr. BACON. Mr. Chairman, a little while ago the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] offered an amendment to this whole paragraph which would have returned the control of relief, aided by the expenditure of Federal money to the respective States. That amendment was defeated.

This amendment has for its purpose the elimination of politics in the administration of this fund. It does not in any way disturb the W. P. A. set-up, except this: Instead of a political administration in the several States, who have used relief funds for political purposes, it substitutes for this political administration a nonpartisan board to be set up by each of the States.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BACON. I yield.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Does the gentleman think that at this time there can be a nonpolitical, nonpartisan board?

Mr. BACON. If it is a nonpartisan board, or a bipartisan board, at least the minority party members would have full knowledge of any attempt to play politics with the taxpayers' money and would be able to resist it.

This amendment sets up a nonpartisan board in the different localities. It is an attempt to cooperate with the present W. P. A. by nonpartisan boards in the States, counties, and several political subdivisions of the States. It continues, however, the present organization in Washington.

Mr. CURLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BACON. No; I have but 5 minutes. It is an attempt to give the States, counties, and smaller political units a "say" about the expenditure of this money and not only Mr. Hopkins' bureaucratic administration. It is an honest attempt to eliminate politics from relief. [Applause.]

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I ask unanimous consent that all debate upon this amendment close in 2 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understands the gentleman withdraws his reservation of a point of order?

Mr. WOODRUM. Yes. The amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. BACON] undertakes to set up what he calls nonpartisan boards in the States, to work in a cooperative effort with the W. P. A. Administrator. It will just be another hurdle, another impediment, another stumbling block in the way of quick administration of this relief fund. We can sit here for days and figure out ways in which we think we might improve on this program, but after all we must either go forward or junk the whole thing. For my part, I think Mr. Hopkins is doing a good job. I think he is doing as good a job as any man could do with the problem he has to handle. He does cooperate with State agencies and works in cooperation with those agencies as far as he can. I hope the amendment will be rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CHURCH: Page 22, line 8, after the word "appropriation", insert the following: "Provided, however, That no part of the funds herein appropriated shall be used for the continuation of the activities of the Resettlement Administration."

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, I feel so keenly against the Tugwellian philosophy of government, his state capitalistic theory of regimentation and control, that I am submitting this amendment in an effort to make absolutely certain that none of these funds will be at the disposition of Dr. Tugwell and the Resettlement Administration.

To indicate the attitude of Dr. Tugwell toward our democratic system of government and the Congress of the United States, which is the very nucleus of that system, I wish to

call your attention to the form of lease used by the Tugwell Resettlement Administration, which makes the licensee or homesteader a mere instrument of the Government. He virtually contracts away his individual freedom. I have already spoken about this matter this afternoon, but I again call your attention to one section of that homestead lease or license which should be of special interest to us as representatives of the people. I read from one of the homesteaders' contracts, form RA-MA 12, revised January 15, 1936, and approved by Administrator Tugwell:

6. Noneligibility to benefits: No Member of or Delegate to Congress or Resident Commissioner shall be permitted to any share or part of this license or to any benefit that may arise thereupon.

No Member of Congress wants to share in these benefits. He speaks as though there really were some benefits, but I personally resent the implication which such a provision in a contract makes. Remember that this contract form is sent to at least the 500,000 people he refers to as likely homesteaders, indirectly expressing to them a bureaucrat's opinion of their representatives in Congress.

I have presented this amendment to give you an opportunity of expressing your convictions on this matter by your vote. I want to give you an opportunity to stop Tugwellism in the United States as a growing theory of government under the New Deal which can certainly be said to be communistic.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHURCH. I am sorry, I cannot yield. The gentleman has plenty of time and has control of it. Mr. Chairman, I ask Members of Congress to express by their vote in favor of this amendment their resentment of this insult. It is an unwarranted reflection on Members of Congress sent throughout the United States and its Territories, scattered broadcast, by Tugwell and his resettlement organization.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, not one cent of this money can be allotted to the Resettlement Administration. It has all to be spent by the Works Progress Administration, except as we otherwise specifically provide in the bill.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Yes.

Mr. CHURCH. I say that under the wording of this bill every nickel of the billion and a half dollars can be used by the President's turning it over to any department and then turning that department or bureau over to Tugwell; the so-called restrictions are not restrictions.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, if this bill passes in its present form the President will not have any authority or power to allot one cent of this money. The appropriation is made by Congress to the Works Progress Administration, to be expended by the Works Progress Administration, and not one iota of authority is carried to the President or anybody else to allot any of this money. Even Mr. Hopkins himself cannot allot it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HULL: On page 22, line 8, after the word "appropriation", insert: "Provided further, That there may be apportioned from the amount herein included for rural rehabilitation and relief to farmers an amount sufficient to provide work-relief projects which will enable farmers indebted to the Farm Credit Administration or the Resettlement Administration for feed and seed loans, to pay such loans from the proceeds of such employment."

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, I should like to explain the situation which brings forth this amendment.

During the terrific drought which affected the dairy region of the Northwest, thousands of dairymen had their crops destroyed. Not only in 1 year but for several years a large

portion of that section of the country had suffered from dry weather, and for a number of years the farmers were on a steady decline so far as financial and other resources were concerned. Then came the drought year of 1934. The Government purchased thousands of head of cattle from those dairymen to keep them from starving, depleting the herds, and then furnished feedstuffs to take care of other cattle. Last year was not a good crop year in many of the counties in that dairy region. In consequence, the amount of the seed loans has grown to a considerable amount. In one county in my district the amount is over \$100,000.

There are many farmers who want to pay, and they cannot pay their feed and seed loans. The Resettlement Administration has endeavored to work out a plan whereby a portion of them can have work on work-relief projects, such as farm-to-market roads. There are loans, however, which were obtained from the Farm Credit Administration. The Farm Credit Administration has manifested no similar interest in the farmers. Its agents have pressed farmers on their seed loans and continue to harass them, even though the situation is plain that payment should not be expected at this time.

I, therefore, present this amendment with the hope that it may have favorable consideration, even though technically a point of order may lie against it. Unless something can be accomplished under this measure and the farmers afforded some relief, the hardships under which they are laboring will become greater instead of lessened. Certainly the farmers who have so long suffered because of conditions over which they had no control are entitled to a full measure of consideration.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, I must insist upon my point of order.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. McCORMACK). The Chair is prepared to rule.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. HULL] proposes a new subject not included in this paragraph, relating to loans, and the Chair holds that the amendment is not germane, and therefore sustains the point of order.

Mr. BEITER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BEITER: Page 21, beginning with line 9, strike out all down to and including line 8, on page 22, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"WORKS PROGRESS AND PUBLIC WORKS ADMINISTRATIONS

"To provide relief, and work relief on useful projects, in the United States and its Territories and possessions:

"By the Works Progress Administration, \$1,075,000,000, to remain available until June 30, 1937 (except as herein otherwise authorized): *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available for the following classes of public projects, Federal and non-Federal, and the amounts to be used for each class shall not, except as hereinafter provided, exceed the respective amounts stated, namely:

"(a) Highways, roads, and streets, \$311,850,000;

"(b) Public buildings, \$118,450,000;

"(c) Parks and other recreational facilities, including buildings therein, \$118,400,000;

"(d) Public utilities, including sewer systems, water supply and purification, airports, and other transportation facilities, \$129,250,000;

"(e) Flood control and other conservation, \$96,900,000;

"(f) White-collar projects, \$64,300,000;

"(g) Women's projects, \$64,300,000;

"(h) Miscellaneous work projects, \$53,600,000;

"(i) National Youth Administration, \$53,600,000; and

"(j) Rural rehabilitation and relief to farmers, \$64,300,000:

Provided further, That the amount specified for any of the foregoing classes may be increased by not to exceed 15 percent thereof by transfer of an amount or amounts from any other class or classes in order to effectuate the purposes of the foregoing appropriation.

"By the Federal Emergency Administration of Public Works \$349,950,000 to remain available until June 30, 1937 (except as herein otherwise provided): *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available for the following classes of public projects, Federal and non-Federal, namely:

"(a) Highways, roads, and streets;

"(b) Public buildings;

"(c) Parks and other recreational facilities, including buildings therein;

"(d) Public utilities, including sewer systems, water supply, and purification, airports, and other transportation facilities; and
"(e) Flood control and other conservation."

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment, to let the gentleman make a short statement.

Mr. BEITER. Mr. Chairman, you have heard of Custer's last stand—well, this may be BEITER's last stand! In offering this amendment I promise not to bore you any further with figures, statistics, or numerical facts of any kind concerning the merits of the public-works program. I do not know, of course, what the ultimate fate of my amendment will be, but I know that whatever the outcome I shall continue to believe in and uphold the public-works plan of permanent improvement. I am thoroughly convinced that the formula is not only practicable but for many reasons far more desirable than any other method. This is my conviction, and recent developments have only served to further my belief.

The newspapers would have us believe that the main issue in this campaign is a personal feud between the heads of the W. P. A. and P. W. A. agencies. This, of course, might make interesting reading, but personalities are in no way involved. I ask that you consider the amendment I have proposed, and vote for it if you believe in a well-planned program of useful permanent public improvement, and against it if you approve of a program of temporary relief.

I have no quarrel with W. P. A. and admire the way in which that agency has taken men and women from the relief rolls and created jobs to fit their capabilities. However, the qualifications of a great proportion of the people on the relief rolls do not fit them for work on construction projects.

Unemployed clerks and destitute seamstresses cannot be converted into stonemasons, steel workers, and cement finishers overnight. Whether we want to continue a program that was originally intended to be used for a short time only and as an emergency measure of abolishing unemployment must be decided here and now. Three years have passed since the first emergency-relief measure was proposed and enacted and the extent to which private industry can reemploy men and women who are without any means of earning a living is still problematical. We can help industry expand its pay rolls if P. W. A. is continued. You are well acquainted with the facts and with what has happened during the past 3 years. What might be expected from both the W. P. A. and P. W. A. is well known to all of you. Let us strike a balance between a rational program and one characterized by sentiment.

If you believe in the old-fashioned and still popular theory that a better life for the American people is available when factories are going full speed, and mills are operating at the highest capacity, then give industry a break! Vote to continue the public-works program.

In brief, this amendment sets aside \$349,950,000 for public-works projects that have been submitted by municipalities in good faith, at the invitation of the Interior Department. Many of them have gone to considerable expense in the preparation of plans, have hired architects and engineers, and sent them here to Washington, only to be told that there were no further funds.

These projects include such things as schoolhouses, water-works, and sewer systems, and the like of that. This amendment, if adopted, would permit 1,500 projects that compare favorably with W. P. A. projects, to be completed.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment that it is not germane to the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. BEITER. I do not.

Mr. DOBBINS. Mr. Chairman, I desire to be heard on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be glad to hear the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DOBBINS. Mr. Chairman, the amendment presented by the gentleman from New York makes no change whatever in the class of work that is to be done. The same language that applies to the various items of this work which the bill provides shall be done under the direction of the Works Progress Administrator is employed in the terms of the amendment which provide for the manner of expenditure of a certain part of those funds which are by this amendment allocated to the Federal Emergency Administration of Public Works. The paragraph begins with the identical language employed in the Work Relief and Employment Relief Act of 1935, except the act of 1935 applied to both these Administrators, while the bill under consideration mentions only one. The amendment, therefore, provides for the transfer of the authority over part of this work, or a division of the authority over this work, leaving, roughly, about 75 percent of the fund to be administered by the Works Progress Administrator and transferring approximately 25 percent of it to the Federal Emergency Administrator of Public Works.

In making this transfer—this is an important point of which I ask the Chair to take notice—in making this transfer the amount of the entire appropriation is reduced by \$50,000. It is, therefore, a retrenchment in expenditures; and even if it were legislation on an appropriation bill it would be proper because of the retrenchment if it be germane to the subject matter of the bill. The question under consideration is whether or not the amendment is germane. I have pointed out that the work to be done is the same work provided to be done by the bill itself by the Works Progress Administrator.

A transfer of authority from one department to another, not merely from one relief agency to another relief agency, but from one executive department to another executive department has been held to be germane. I refer the Chair to Hinds' Precedents, volume IV, paragraphs 3885 and 3887, cited on page 394 of Jefferson's Manual; and I am going to read the digest of those decisions:

To a bill making appropriations for the Indian Service, an amendment transferring the management of Indian affairs from the Department of the Interior to the War Department, but providing no reduction of expenditures, was held to be germane as an amendment, but subject to the point of order, as being a change of law, and no retrenchment appearing as the result of the proposed change.

The amendment here under consideration, however, proposes a retrenchment, and this makes it germane.

In the second decision I cite to the Chair the retrenchment was made, and I read the digest of the decision:

To the pension appropriation bill, a proposed amendment transferring the Pension Bureau from the Department of the Interior to the War Department; also providing that the offices of Commissioner and Deputy Commissioner of Pensions be abolished, and that the duties of those offices be performed by Army officers, to be designated for that purpose, without additional pay, was held to be in order, being germane and retrenching expenditures in the manner provided in the rule.

The pending amendment goes nothing like as far as the amendments discussed in those two decisions, because the pending amendment provides for no new duties to be performed, for no different class of work to be carried out, but simply in form establishes, and in fact continues, a division of responsibility in the administration of the fund, transferring a portion of it from one administrator to another, and providing a reduction of \$50,000 in the amount required to be expended.

Upon this authority, Mr. Chairman, I submit this amendment is in order and not subject to either of the criticisms pointed out.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Virginia desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. WOODRUM. I do not think so, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule.

The bill before the Committee provides—

To continue to provide relief and work relief on useful projects in the United States and its Territories and possessions by the Works Progress Administration.

A certain sum of money is appropriated and allocated for the purposes therein stated. The amendment proposed by

the gentleman from New York strikes out this section and substitutes not only provisions which refer to the Works Progress Administration but also inserts new language referring to the Federal Emergency Administrator of Public Works, which is a separate and distinct governmental agency from the Works Progress Administration.

The Chair has before him a decision in a case where it being proposed that the Secretary of War issue medals to personnel of the Army, an amendment was offered proposing that Secretaries of other departments issue similar medals to personnel of the Navy, the Coast Guard, as well as the Army. This was held to be not germane.

It does not necessarily follow that two subjects are germane because they are related to one another.

There is a long line of decisions supporting the fundamental proposition that it is not in order to propose to amend one individual proposition by another individual proposition, even though they may be of the same class.

It appears to the Chair that the proposed amendment seeks to amend one individual proposition by the addition of another individual proposition. They may be in the same class, but the pending paragraph relates to the Works Progress Administration, while the proposed amendment attempts to amend it by bringing within its provision an allocation of funds to be utilized and expended through the Public Works Administration.

It therefore seems to the Chair that the amendment is not germane for this reason, and the Chair therefore sustains the point of order.

Mr. McLEAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. McLEAN: On page 21, line 19, after the word "roads", strike out the word "and", and after the word "streets" insert "and elimination of railroad grade crossings."

Mr. McLEAN. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is perfectly clear, and there should be no objection to it.

No one will deny the necessity for the elimination of railroad grade crossings, and the necessity becomes greater as time goes on and speed and use of automobiles increase. Much work is being done by the Public Works Administration in this regard. In many sections of New Jersey, by reason of our proximity to the cities of New York and Philadelphia, there are many grade crossings which must be eliminated. Much progress has been made along this line by the cooperation of State, counties, cities, and railroads. Many projects were under way when the depression developed and had to be abandoned, and now remain in an unfinished state. They offer excellent opportunity for relief employment, mostly manual labor being all that is required. I send to the desk and ask that it be read and printed as a part of my remarks a telegram from the Hon. Edward Nugent, city attorney of the city of Elizabeth, N. J., which explains the situation in my own city, and except for the number of crossings in the single projects is typical of many others throughout the State. No better use can be made of a portion of the money provided for public works under this bill. I strongly urge the adoption of the amendment.

By direction of Mayor Joseph A. Brophy, Elizabeth, N. J., your attention is respectfully called to the imperative requirements of our city and its peculiar situation respecting elimination of grade crossings accompanied with municipal request for your aid and official support in presenting Elizabeth's claim for priority in the Public Works allocation of Federal money for eliminating grade crossings in New Jersey. Utility commissioners March 11, 1915, initiated proceedings to hear and determine whether or not 22 highways at Elizabethport intersected by the main line of the Central Railroad of New Jersey were dangerous to public safety. Fourteen years were consumed taking testimony. Experts of national reputation assisted the commission. Exhibits, maps, and detailed drawings were filed, and on May 7, 1929, the board determined as facts that "each of the 22 public highways named in the proceedings crossed by the railroad should be altered, that all the crossings are dangerous to public safety", and work was ordered to begin January 31, 1931, to be continually carried on to completion within 3 years, or by January 1, 1934. Concrete abutments, retaining walls, and filling for railroad embankments was begun before 1931, but in 1932 financial conditions prevented the railroad from proceeding, and Governor Moore was obliged to use State

contribution for emergency relief. Result, work at standstill approximately 3 years. Present status work approved by Board of Utility Commissioners of New Jersey, and well advanced on list of recommended projects. Plans completed in conjunction with board engineers. Work eliminating main-line dangerous crossings in city of 114,000, where labor, skilled and unskilled, available and every detail complete for instituting project.

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the purposes sought to be accomplished by the amendment just offered are already contemplated in the break-down which is carried in this bill. It is purely surplusage, and I do not think the bill should be loaded up with things already in it; therefore I ask that the amendment be defeated.

Mr. SHANNON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SHANNON. Is it the purpose to carry on until the final vote on this bill this evening?

Mr. WOODRUM. It is the intention to complete the bill this evening, and I may say to the gentleman that we are making splendid progress.

Mr. McLEAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. McLEAN. Did I understand the gentleman to say that the provisions of this bill contemplate a portion of this money will be allocated for the elimination of grade crossings?

Mr. WOODRUM. It is not specifically earmarked, but it is set out in the break-down that a portion of it may be used for this purpose by the Works Progress Administrator.

Mr. McLEAN. And the gentleman has reason to believe it will be so used?

Mr. WOODRUM. It was specifically so stated in the hearings.

Mr. TABER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. I understood Mr. Hopkins to say he did not intend to use this money for grade-crossing elimination. I may be mistaken, but that is my understanding.

Mr. WOODRUM. I think the gentleman is mistaken. He said it would not be used for "major" grade-crossing elimination.

Mr. CHRISTIANSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. CHRISTIANSON. Does the gentleman consider the language "highways, roads, and streets" is broad enough to cover the construction of bridges?

Mr. WOODRUM. I think so.

Mr. WHITE. Is it the intention to take a final vote on this bill tonight?

Mr. WOODRUM. We want to take the bill up to the final vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. McLEAN].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TABER: Page 22, line 8, after the word "appropriation", insert "Provided, That no part of the appropriations contained herein shall be used for the construction or operation of transient or hobo camps."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, this was one of the great abuses of the P. W. A. and the W. P. A. These camps were erected in communities and large numbers of transients gathered there, and then the camps were taken away and the communities left to provide for them. I think the Congress should provide against a recurrence of that abuse, and, therefore, I hope the amendment which I have just offered will be adopted.

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I may say to the gentleman that the hearings show that none of those camps are now in operation, and the program has been entirely abandoned. This amendment, if adopted, would simply amount to surplus, and I ask that the Members defeat the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MARTIN of Colorado: Page 22, after line 8, insert the following: "all rehabilitation loan payments to farmers in the drought area during the period May 1 to November 1, 1935, be, and the same are hereby, canceled and held for naught as obligations against the said farmers and their property: *Provided*, That this act shall not apply to standard rehabilitation cases designated by the Resettlement Administration as class 30 cases."

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I have offered this amendment, which is copied from my H. R. 12415, for the purpose of exhibiting the gross injustice and discrimination which has been worked against relief farmers in the drought area of parts of eight States. Prior to May 1, 1935, all needy farmers in the drought area who could not qualify for bona fide or standard rehabilitation loans were on direct relief and were direct-relief cases just the same as in the case of city dwellers. In April 1935 the relief administrator issued an order putting all these farmers under a mortgage-loan system. They were offered a loan, and they had to take the loan or else they were out. Under this order perhaps 8,000 farmers in my State, most of them in my district, were required to take loans whether they had any security or not, whereas a similar case in the city was continued on direct relief. Most of them had been burnt out until they had nothing. The result is that those farmers are mortgaged whether they have any security or not. They continue to owe this debt to the Government. The Resettlement Administration, recognizing the injustice of that situation, on November 1 last substituted for the loans a system of subsistence grants, meaning direct relief.

But the fact remains that all these farmers for the period of May 1 to November 1, 1935, were under loans and mortgages to the Government for what was really simply direct relief, and in all justice and fairness these loans ought to be canceled.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. MAY. Is not the gentleman afraid that this would be the beginning of a campaign to create a paramount issue in the Presidential election of 1940 to surrender all the Federal land bank and home owners' loans and all other similar loans that have been made?

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. Not at all; and let me say to my friend that when the Resettlement Administration canceled the loan system and put these farmers under subsistence grants on November 1, 1935, he recognized the injustice of having placed them under a loan system in the first place. The account is now closed and all it could cost the Government would be the amount of the alleged loans made to these farmers during that period of time from May 1 to November 1, 1935.

And, may I ask in fairness and justice, why should a farmer—a tenant, we will say, on a drought-burned farm and having a family—be arbitrarily shifted from direct relief and put under a mortgage loan which in 9 cases out of 10 he could never repay, although it would hang over his head, while if the same man with his family lived in town he would be continued on direct relief and owe the Government nothing? Why, Mr. Chairman, even farm hands, even ex-farm hands, people living in small towns who had an agricultural background, even coal miners—were arbitrarily swept under this loan system and budgeted for a year's necessities and made a loan accordingly on a monthly

installment plan. I feel fully justified in saying that it presents a clear case of gross injustice and discrimination. These alleged loans were and are nothing but relief grants and ought to be so treated, and the loans canceled and these poor farmers absolved from the knowledge that they are indebted to the Government, which may yet fall upon them to collect. I can see no precedent in such action for cancellation of farm and home loans.

Now, understand, I am not charging the Resettlement Administration with creating this situation. It was handed over to them ready made when Resettlement was set up last summer. I deeply appreciate the action of the Resettlement Administrator in changing these farmers from loans to direct relief the 1st of last November.

I spent nearly all of my alleged congressional vacation last summer working for this change, and I have felt that its accomplishment was the most worth-while thing I have done since my return to Congress. But justice will never be fully done until these alleged mortgage loans are charged off the books. I shall ask leave to insert as part of my remarks a letter written by me to the Resettlement Administrator proposing this cancellation. In response to the letter I have been given to understand that the Government will not press for repayment, but I have deemed it advisable to introduce the bill I referred to, which, stripped of the whereases, is embodied in my amendment. Some day, in one way or another, these alleged loans, 90 percent of which can never be paid, must be charged off the books, and it ought to be done by act of Congress, which is the only authority that can do it.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, I insist upon the point of order.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to include therein the letter written by me to the Resettlement Administrator, already referred to, covering this matter much more clearly and fully than I have been able to do under the 5-minute rule.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, the following is the letter to the Resettlement Administrator:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., January 15, 1936.

Hon. REXFORD G. TUGWELL,
Resettlement Administrator, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. TUGWELL: At this time I feel it incumbent upon me as a Representative of the farm drought area, endeavoring to bring about an adjustment or equality of treatment between rural and urban populations on relief, to burden you with a review as briefly as possible of the rehabilitation activity in that region and what further I think ought to be done about it.

To begin with, rehabilitation loans were limited to that type of farmers who gave promise of being able to carry on if refinanced on the ground and who were able to give reasonable security for the loans. This class proved to be a minority, perhaps not 15 percent of the farmers in southeastern Colorado and portions of adjoining States. (Now still further reduced, and properly so, by transfer to subsistence grants.)

On April 17, 1936, Mr. R. E. Klely, director of Rural Rehabilitation for Colorado, acting on instructions from F. E. R. A., Washington, issued Bulletin No. 654 to all county administrators. The first paragraph of instructions reads as follows:

"First. All farmers who are receiving feed will be transferred to rural rehabilitation rolls. This applies to those clients working on a farm, for a farmer, and to farmers, whether they be renters, lessees, farm owners, or hired help."

Under this order some 8,000 cases were arbitrarily swept under the rehabilitation loan plan. Rural Rehabilitation had to accept them without question and they had to accept the rural rehabilitation loan or go without relief.

Budgets for the ensuing year were made up for these cases, to be paid in monthly installments, and the farmers were required to execute mortgage notes to secure payment. I may say here that, perhaps, not 10 percent of these farmers had any substantial security. Perhaps half or more of them were merely tenants. In many cases they were merely farm hands. In some cases they were merely ex-farm hands. The classification included persons living in towns and villages who had an agricultural background or had worked on a farm. Colonies of coal miners who lived on small owned or rented tracts of land were classed as agricultural. In the great majority of cases it was obvious that there was no possibility of repayment.

The new status became effective as of May 1 and the first loan checks were paid in May. So far as I could learn, the May payment was satisfactory. The applicants received maximum monthly payments for May. But from May on, the following is a typical case: The farmer got \$43.50 in May; \$17 in June; \$10 in July; and at the time I saw him, the first of October, he had received no further payments. I believe the record will show it to have been the rule that the great bulk of the monthly payments were materially reduced after the first one. In addition, there were several serious delays in payment, involving 1 to 2 months' time. Two of these delays occurred between May 1 and November. The delay in November and December 1935 payments grew out of the transfer of these cases from loans to subsistence grants.

I went through the district early in October and found universal dissatisfaction with the plan. The chief grounds of dissatisfaction were: Cutting of the monthly amount from month to month and delay in payment; distress among merchants who had begun giving these farmers credit on the basis of their supposed monthly allowance; distress among banks carrying the merchants; and, later, disqualification of the farmers for works-progress projects.

Another distressing feature involved a considerable percentage of farmers who, after receiving their May check, refused to sign the mortgage note, and thereby became disqualified not only for the rehabilitation loan but for all other forms of Government relief. There were 200 such cases in Baca County, Colo., which is the heart of the Dust Bowl in Colorado. These families lived in a state of semistarvation.

As the result of my investigation I sent a number of telegrams to you, to Mr. Hopkins, and to the President. I may say here that as to nearly every statement I made in those telegrams or elsewhere concerning the plan, I first checked up with rehabilitation agents, who almost invariably verified the information which had been given me by farmers, merchants, bankers, and others.

During my investigation, I came to the conclusion that the farmers swept under the loan plan by bulletin no. 654, were in fact purely relief cases and not loan cases in any true sense. The bulky file I have accumulated on this matter shows that this is the view of the Resettlement Administration from the Washington offices down to the county agents.

And this is not all. I have seen official correspondence showing clearly that the representative of F. E. R. A. who caused this change to be made was advised by both F. E. R. A. and R. R. A. directors that these were relief cases and not loan cases, and predicting some of the chief evils which have developed in the plan.

Now for the question. If the farmers transferred to loans under the bulletin no. 654 were relief and not rehabilitation cases, why should not the loans be canceled or charged up to relief where they properly belong?

This question arose in my mind before there had occurred to me possibilities of new difficulties which I now foresee. I very deeply appreciate the action of the Resettlement Administration in transferring these farmers from loans to subsistence grants. And also the action of the Works Progress Administration in qualifying a large percentage of them for work, which process is now under way. But I am apprehensive that the farmers who are given work will be confronted with the requirement of surrendering their pay checks in satisfaction of loans or advances made them between May 1 and November 1.

In my telegrams to the President, to yourself, and to Mr. Hopkins, I have stressed the fact that the farmer with a family on relief who owned no lands, had no crops or income or means of support, was in a condition entirely comparable with the city worker on relief. The farmer was forced under a mortgage loan for his subsistence. The city worker was granted relief gratis. When Works Progress came, the city worker on relief was qualified for employment at \$48 to \$62 per month and owed the Government nothing. But the farmer who has now been qualified for work will owe the Government for what was really direct relief. It is my firm conviction that equity and fair dealing would dictate the cancellation of these specific loans or their conversion into relief by some proper order.

I am not here mentioning seed or feed or stock or any other form of loans made to farmers prior to the Bulletin No. 654 but only to the loans made them under the budgets executed pursuant to said bulletin.

In conclusion, I would very much appreciate the opportunity of going over the question with you personally at your convenience. If this audience can be had, I would consider it helpful if you were to cause to be prepared a table or statement showing the number of cases under classes 40 and 41 as they are known of the rehabilitation loans and the approximate total amount advanced by the Government to these classes.

Very respectfully,

JOHN A. MARTIN,
Member of Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado relates to a new subject matter and is not germane, and the Chair therefore sustains the point of order.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, a little more than a year ago the President requested of the Congress an appropriation of \$4,800,000,000 to carry on a work-relief program. At that time representations were made that employment would be provided for 3,500,000 of our people and the impression prevailed that the program would stimulate private industry and result in a material diminution of the unemployment load. Broad discretionary powers were delegated to executive agencies to carry on the program. Unlimited funds enabled excursions into all fields of experiment. Professors vied with politicians in providing ways to spend money. The speculation spree of the late twenties was imitated by the spending spree of the past year as the urge was given to spend our way into prosperity. What a lovely dream it proved to be, but what a sad awakening.

Today another blanket appropriation is being pushed through the House. It comes as a result of the President's message in which he said in part, "There are at present approximately 5,300,000 families and unattached persons who are in need of some form of public assistance." This is a startling confession of failure. Based on a minimum estimate of three to a family it means that more than 15,000,000 persons must be maintained at the expense of the Government. It means that after 3 years of experiment, extravagance, and exploitation, the present administration comes to the American people and admits the futility of its efforts. It means that the experiments with everything from pigs to parlors are but the nebulous creations of theorists. It means that the extravagances of all the newly created Federal bureaus regulating and ordering the food, clothing, and shelter of the American people are shameful wastes and riotous profligacy. It means that the exploitation of those in distress for purely political purposes constitutes one of the most shocking episodes in American history. On the eve of a national election the New Dealers admit defeat. They blandly tell the American people that even though we have prostituted public office by casting aside civil-service requirements; even though we have created political sinecures for hundreds of thousands of our henchmen and vassals; even though we have penalized businessmen and punished wage earners by the imposition of an unbearable tax burden; even though we have made no appreciable reduction in the unemployment load after spending billions of dollars in fantastic schemes and on fanciful projects, nevertheless they request a further appropriation in order to carry on their program.

It is not hard to find the cause for the defeat which the New Dealers have suffered in their efforts to put potential American wage earners back to work. The reason can best be given by quotations from men who have been identified with, at one time or another, the New Deal program. No more ardent, loyal, and faithful disciple could be found than Gen. Hugh Johnson, who is quoted as having said, in referring to the Works Progress Administration's program:

Sixty percent of this invented work is a needlessly expensive and fatuous gesture. The only argument is that it preserves pride against humiliation of home relief. Yet to go on work relief the rules require that a man first go on home relief. To get there he must submit to the equivalent of a pauper's oath and a most humiliating inquisition. More than one-half of all this effort is prodigal pretense justified by nothing.

That statement constitutes a strong indictment. It goes to the heart of the issue. It indicates definitely that the concept and motive of the program is wrong. The American wage earner still desires to preserve his dignity and self-respect. He resents both the necessity for a pauper's oath and the inquisition attendant upon investigation. There can be little doubt that the quotation to which I have just referred is tenable, justifiable, and honest. But others have also brought their contribution. Robert L. Johnson, a former Relief Director of Pennsylvania, referring to the change in administration at the time of the introduction of the Works Progress Administration, is reported to have said: "I can't speak for the Nation, but I do know that one unwise move in Pennsylvania, against which I fought, resulted in \$7,000,000 being wasted—wasted just as truly as

if someone had taken 7,000,000 dollar bills and used them to light cigars."

Further observation of a similar character might be added which would indicate that New Dealers themselves are disappointed and chagrined over the ineffectiveness of the program. The chief cause for the defeat of the New Dealers program and the waste of billions of dollars can be laid at the door of political manipulators. The attention of the American public has been called to the glaring irregularities in many States. Work relief is honeycombed with politics. Honest men seeking an honest day's work for an honest dollar's pay should not be required to enlist in any political party. Efforts of large industrial employers to coerce, intimidate or compel their employees have been denounced on all sides. I submit that the same standard should apply and even more care should be exercised when the Federal Government using taxpayers' money employs those who are in distress on public-works projects. Unfortunately, however, such has not been the case. It has come to the attention to those in Congress that county administrators have declared that workers who were not in sympathy with the W. P. A. program and the political administration in power would be eliminated from the W. P. A. pay roll, and in order to bring about a compliance by the unfortunate workman, the demand has been made that supervisors and foremen should report those who might be critical without delay. Our attention has been directed to measures of penalty and punishment visited upon those who refused to become a part of the political party presently administering relief. Workmen on W. P. A. projects have been required to purchase tickets, secure subscriptions, and in other ways lend their aid to the highly specialized political machine which seeks to perpetuate itself at the expense of the American taxpayer. In almost a literal sense we have witnessed a program by which bread was to be bartered for ballots. The American people had been told that the exploiter in business was to be banished. I submit that the exploiter in human distress and misery is far more reprehensible than the exploiter who confines his efforts to other channels.

The money changers have been driven from the temple, but the ballot traders had an invitation extended to them and a warmth of welcome assured them as a part of the New Deal hospitality.

Our more abundant life seems to consist chiefly in abundance of evidence that ballots can be bought and that human distress can be put on the auction block to the highest political bidder. The administration in power should invite a searching inquiry into the whole Works Progress Administration in order that its true purposes might be carried out. Reference should be made to the costs of operation which result from the methods presently pursued in handling the problem at Washington rather than permitting its administration in each of the States. The same amount of money, if allocated to each of the States on a basis by which the States would contribute a share of the expense, would enable worth-while projects to be developed and carried on under local supervision and would provide for the employee a living wage rather than a pauper's pittance. Let each of the States be charged with the responsibility for its relief program. Let each of the States receive from the Federal Government a contribution in proportion to the contribution which the State makes in Federal taxes. Let each of the States insist upon an honest day's work for an honest day's wage. We owe no responsibility to those who do not want work but who are anxious to live at the expense of a paternalistic government. The old Colonial New England standard is still applicable, "He that will not work, should not eat." Our sympathy goes out to those who by reason of physical disabilities, old age, or other circumstances prevent the acceptance of employment. To these the Federal Government as well as the State governments owe a duty. For this group everything should be done which will provide security and livelihood.

My conviction is that America will respond to this challenge for the care of those unfortunate unemployables, but I am equally convinced that there should not be saddled

upon the shoulder of the energetic, ambitious workman of America the tax load to provide for their neighbors who are slothful, shiftless, and indolent. In view of the fact that public-works projects and human misery have been seized upon by dictatorially minded political craftsmen to secure absolute loyalty from the distressed and unemployed, it is but natural that protests from all sides have been raised against the Works Progress Administration. To support the present measure would be to condone, excuse, and even approve that which has been condemned by impartial, non-partisan observers throughout the land.

These are the conditions which have brought about the admitted defeat of the New Deal program for unemployment. I believe that the majority of American workmen desire to dignify their work by engaging in worth-while projects. I believe that there is still present in America a spirit of industry and thrift. I believe that if the opportunity were offered to those who are anxious for employment, that they would respond by applying themselves energetically to the tasks assigned to them. I believe that there are still avenues of usefulness open to the American workman in which he may demonstrate his ability and his willingness to work. I believe that the Federal Government's funds could be used by proper allocation, divorced from political control, toward this end. I believe that industry could more readily absorb millions of unemployed if the vacillating, inconsistent, and uncertain policy of the present administration were to be replaced by one of definiteness which would encourage confidence. This faith gives me my only hope for the future.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STEFAN: Page 22, line 8, after the word "appropriation", insert a new paragraph to read as follows: "No part of the appropriations herein authorized shall be expended in industrial-plant training programs, except such industrial-plant training be bona-fide vocational training, and not a device to utilize the services of vocational trainees for private profit."

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I do not believe there is anything controversial about this particular amendment. It is simply an amendment offered for the purpose of safeguarding public funds from exploitation by private industry. This matter came to the attention of the House Committee on Education sometime ago when we learned from the representatives of labor and the representatives of the Bureau of Education that the reports that the Members had read in the newspapers that public funds had been exploited by private industry in plant training were true.

The question came before the Committee on Education, and we adopted in the Deen bill the very amendment I am offering to this particular bill in order to safeguard these public funds.

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CONNERY. Is this an amendment to take care of the situation about which we had so many complaints in the Committee on Labor about private employers taking learners, under the plea it was vocational education, and putting them in plants that were making dresses and shirts under sweat-shop conditions and then selling them in the open market in competition with goods made under decent conditions?

Mr. STEFAN. I want to tell the gentleman from Massachusetts that these goods were sold in competition with merchandise produced in bona-fide factories where the American standard of living was being maintained.

We want to protect public funds from being exploited by private industry exploiting and enslaving the labor of America.

Mr. CONNERY. If the gentleman will yield further, we had many, many complaints of that sort, and I referred them to Mr. Hopkins, and without mentioning the States I may say that he went into certain States and investigated matters and cleaned up conditions there. However, I am in

favor of the gentleman's amendment in order to see to it that this does not happen again.

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman will agree that this would safeguard the matter and prevent such exploitation of labor.

Mr. CONNERY. Yes.

Mr. STEFAN. There is, in my opinion, today a unified effort, backed by tremendous capital, to turn down and destroy the high standard of American living. If that effort succeeds today it will require the same amount of effort, the same amount of sacrifice, and the same amount of time to bring it back as it is today.

The past history of organized labor to give to the American working man and the American working woman a high standard of living is a pathway strewn with a story of great tragedy and great sacrifice on the part of those Americans who wish to give an equal chance to all Americans to share alike the blessings of this land of the free and the home of the brave.

If nothing is done at this time, when millions of dollars of the taxpayers' money is being used in an effort to keep idle people employed, to safeguard the exploitation of that money, I predict that we will soon be confronted with an era of slavery among American men and women workers.

The movement to enslave the American man and woman once more is Nation-wide, and, in my opinion, it is backed by a powerful organized minority in our country.

Today American industry is exploiting slave labor, not only in the Far East but in other parts of the world, by forcing the products of this labor into the salesrooms of American places of business. Here this foreign-made merchandise, because it is cheaper in price, also attracts the attention of the multitude of unemployed, who, because they have little money with which to buy, are forced to buy merchandise made by slave labor. As a result, merchandise made by American workers, whose wages are necessarily higher, due to our determination to maintain our high standard of American living, is left on the shelves unpurchased, with the result of more and more unemployed American men and women.

It is no longer any secret that certain American industry is now, and has been for many years, profiting greatly by the exploitation of so-called slave labor in foreign lands, and that this industry is ever on the alert to exploit low-cost labor or slave labor in our own land.

To allow this to continue will bring but one result—enslavement of the American man and the American woman and the breaking down forever of the high standard of American living.

It is because I have given this matter much personal study; because I have visited the factories in other lands from which this foreign merchandise is made; because I have followed that very merchandise back to our own country and into our stores; and knowing the story first-hand, I have taken much personal interest in the protection of the American labor market for the American workers.

I call attention of Members of this House to H. R. 12120, a bill to provide for the further development of vocational education in the several States and Territories.

This is a good bill and provides that the Government shall appropriate a certain sum of money to aid the several States in teaching men and women how to earn their own living. It is endorsed by farm organizations. Our committee has held many hearings on this bill. These hearings developed that through the aid of vocational training some communities, by taking advantage of its benefits, have not applied for Government relief.

Our bill is changed somewhat since its first writing, due to these interesting and lengthy hearings. It was passed unanimously out of our committee after these changes had been made. A similar bill has passed the Senate, but I am advised that no hearings have been held by the Senate on that bill.

While I favor the principles in the Senate bill with some reservations, I shall oppose it vigorously if certain sections of our House bill are not retained; especially if one section is not retained. The section is one of which I claim authorship and which section I hope the House will help me in retaining.

The section, which is no. 6 in the House bill, reads as follows:

No part of the appropriations herein authorized shall be expended in industrial-plant training programs, except such industrial-plant training be bona-fide vocational training, and not a device to utilize the services of vocational trainees for private profit.

The purpose of this section is to protect American labor from enslavement by those industries which would exploit cheap labor with the taxpayers' money. Its ultimate purpose is to maintain the high standard of American living by protecting the American man and the American woman from exploitation by so-called sweatshops.

The taxpayers' money has already been exploited. Investigations have been made and certain recommendations have been made to stop this exploitation of taxpayers' money. In this new section in the vocational education bill we members of the House Committee on Education feel that we have a sure safeguard against any future or possible use of taxpayers' money by private enterprise which has as its purpose the enslavement of men and women by certain industries who have been driven from their old locations by the principles of high standards of living.

Investigations show that certain Southern States are the targets for scouts seeking cheap labor. People living in the Northern and Eastern States, where many factories have closed down, will be interested to know that the taxpayers' money has in some cases been used to induce the moving away from their localities into fresher fields by certain industries who have one objective in mind today—"capture cheap labor in order to secure greater profits."

Members of this House should know that a series of complaints were made within the last year to various departments of our Government regarding the labor standards of plant-training programs conducted under public-school offices and reimbursed from Federal funds. Certain investigators made visits and investigations in at least a dozen plants and trade schools under public supervision and control in various cities, and also to plant-training programs supervised and financed by certain firms. Members of this House should know that as a result of certain investigations, it has been found that the cotton-garment, rayon, and silk industries are migrating, and that certain powerful agencies are stimulating this migration. Chambers of commerce, which wish to improve local business conditions; power companies, which wish to secure clients for sale of power; agents of railroad companies, who wish to secure transportation orders; owners of unoccupied factory buildings, who wish to secure a return on their investment, are among the stimulating factors which are resulting in this migration. The industries which are seeking new locations are lending a willing ear to these agencies because they claim they are facing labor difficulties; because they find that the passage of the Cooper-Hawes bill does not give them the advantage of low-cost prison operation; because they wish to expand their production; and most of all because they want locations where they can secure an abundant supply of cheap labor.

Various communities are aiding in this migration of factories from their old location by offering tax exemptions for as much as 5 years. In some cases factories are secured by gifts, city bonds, and city funds. Some contributions are made toward pay rolls for limited periods of adjustment. An abundant supply of workers with high-school education have been trained for these factories at public expense. It is known that workers have been trained for the new industries in plant training programs conducted under public supervision and control, and that applications for reimbursements from State and Federal funds have been made for seven plant training programs in operation at the time of the survey.

I am sure that most Members of this House object to irregular practices such as those in production where workers are trained on production without pay up to as many as 12 weeks, and then transferred to the pay roll as learners' wages, and goods produced without payment of regular

wages being sold on the open market to compete with merchandise made by workers on regular wages, based on the high standard of living.

That taxpayers' money has been used for private profit by these industries is known, and even the superintendent of the factories or the foremen were appointed as teachers and paid at public expense.

I know Members of this House will object when the good name of the public school is used to cloak certain schemes for commercial gain and to cover practices contrary to Government regulations.

I believe in the use of these vocational-education funds in teaching men and women skilled labor insofar as they are not being exploited in mass production for the private benefit of sweatshops, and it is for that reason that I hope Members of this House will work with me in the retention of this section 6 of the House bill for vocational education.

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order.

This whole question was developed in the colloquy between the gentleman from Nebraska and the gentleman from Massachusetts. There were abuses of this kind, like there were other abuses in this program. They were called to the attention of the Works Progress Administrator. He investigated them, as the gentleman from Massachusetts has said, and they have been entirely cleaned up. We could stay here from now until the crack of doom and continue to write inhibitions into this bill.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman would approve an amendment to safeguard and prevent such enslavement of American labor happening again?

Mr. WOODRUM. I will say to my friend that we could write any number of amendments here that nobody could object to, but the condition the gentleman refers to does not now exist, and to put such an amendment in the bill is simply shadow-boxing. There is no use of cluttering up this bill with perfectly useless provisions. I may say to my friend from Massachusetts that whatever the merits of the amendment may be Mr. Hopkins has cleaned the situation up and we should not now slur him by writing something into the bill.

Mr. CONNERY. You are really doing a favor to Mr. Hopkins by helping him out, because they are still at it; and if we put this in the bill, it will give Mr. Hopkins a chance to wipe it out.

Mr. STEFAN. I wish the gentleman would not construe my remarks in a partisan way to the detriment of Mr. Hopkins.

Mr. WOODRUM. I acquit the gentleman of any partisan motive.

Mr. BOILEAU. Let me say that I have heard within a month of conditions at present such as the gentleman from Nebraska has stated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. STEFAN) there were 37 ayes and 61 noes.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 22, line 8, after the word "appropriation", insert a new proviso, as follows: "Provided further, That the Administrator may certify out of the funds made available by this subsection grants to States applying therefor to aid needy persons who have no legal settlement in any one State or community, and to aid in assisting cooperation and self-help associations for the barter of goods and services."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that that is legislation on an appropriation bill and not germane.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from California desire to be heard?

Mr. SCOTT. I do not.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment clearly is not germane, and the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. MAVERICK. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 22, line 4, after the word "farmers", strike out "\$85,500,000" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "\$160,500,000."

Mr. MAVERICK. Mr. Chairman, in offering this amendment I am fully conscious that the Republicans will vote against it 100 percent and the Democrats about 98 percent. [Laughter.]

I do it to make a record because the matter it concerns is extremely important.

THREE PHASES—DAM, PATRIOTIC HEAT, AND ISM—BUT NOTHING SETTLED

What have we done today? We have gone along in an easy way on three major phases. In the first phase we spent 40 minutes naming a dam. I think that was all right because it was named for a distinguished gentleman, but if this is not congressional boondoggling, I will eat my hat. [Laughter.] And we spent about 45 minutes in being horror-struck over the alien situation—

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAVERICK. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman says his amendment is going to be voted against 100 percent on our side and 98 percent on his side. Then what is he doing now?

Mr. MAVERICK. Maybe I am boondoggling, but if I am, I ought to have the right to do so, because there has been so much of it here that I should have my portion of the time allotted to me for that purpose. But let me proceed on the second major phase of today's business. We were horror-struck over this alien situation, and we made speeches on "Americanism" and got full of patriotic heat. But neither in the naming of this dam nor in excluding aliens from the relief rolls have we settled any economic question whatever. Then the third was the usual thing, Tugwellism. It came up, and that was spoken of in a horror-struck way by a Republican colleague. And by denouncing "Tugwellism" no economic question was solved and nobody got jobs or bacon and beans.

Let me discuss this amendment, which is in the nature of agricultural relief, and leave Tugwell out for a minute, and I hope not to mention him again for a while. We are absolutely passing over the fundamental question of the agricultural population of the United States. We have a situation in reference to tenants and sharecroppers and agricultural workers, where people are being dispossessed all over the United States. We are doing nothing about it. The Rural Resettlement Administration is an organization which puts people back to work on the farm and leads them into land-ownerships, or at least into making a living.

SO CERTAIN AS THE RISING OF THE SUN

I have said here many times that I am in favor of this program for Mr. Hopkins, and I think it is absolutely necessary. But I do think that some day we are going to have to get down and talk about the real economic questions that we have before us. That is all I have to say. I do not suppose there is any necessity for anybody to speak against the amendment because I know it will be voted down. But I have made a record, and, so certain as the rising of the sun, some day we must meet the issue.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAVERICK. Yes.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Eighty-five million dollars in the bill for the farmers; and if that should be increased by 15 percent that would amount to \$95,000,000. Mr. Tugwell now has over \$100,000,000 unexpended for that purpose.

Mr. MAVERICK. I know, but that is allotted.

Mr. BUCHANAN. There is \$200,000,000, and yet you say nothing has been done for the farmers.

Mr. MAVERICK. I repeat, it has been allotted. Rural rehabilitation must now practically stop, one of the most necessary for America. We cannot pass this over forever.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. BIERMANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I do not want to take up the time of the Committee at this late hour, but there are a few facts and figures I want to have before the Committee before the vote takes place Monday. They have been ably set out in a letter written to me by an able and distinguished gentleman from Iowa, a State administrator, Mr. L. S. Hill, and I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this place by the insertion of the letter.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The letter is as follows:

WORKS PROGRESS ADMINISTRATION,
ROYAL UNION LIFE BUILDING,
Des Moines, Iowa, May 1, 1936.

Hon. FRED BIERMANN, M. C.,

House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Enclosed are the latest break-downs by counties of W. P. A. employment in your district.

It is probably unnecessary for me to remind you that continuous employment of these people is of serious consequence, or to point out again that the Iowa W. P. A. has been the only Federal work agency which has successfully met this problem in our State.

It has been brought to my attention that a determined drive to earmark \$700,000,000 of the proposed work-relief funds for next year for other Federal work agencies is in process.

You will recall at a conference a month or more ago we discussed the unemployment problem and considered what should be done to take care of it in Iowa during the next year.

Figures then showed that W. P. A. was employing approximately 36,000 people, while all other agencies were employing less than 1,700. There is no quarrel between the Iowa W. P. A. and other agencies. W. P. A. would gladly surrender the burden of providing employment, even to the point of closing up all W. P. A. activities.

The fact remains, however, that other agencies have not provided employment, and indications are certain they will not during the coming year. The enclosed tabulation, by counties in your district, reveals that despite reductions in the number of W. P. A. employees and despite several weeks of spring weather, other agencies are still far below the number of relief people at work that they were expected to take care of.

A list of 12 reasons why you should approve a \$700,000,000 allocation of relief funds to P. W. A. for next year is before me. Let me, in the light of experience during the last 6 months, try and give the W. P. A. side of this vexatious problem. The P. W. A. statement of "brief reasons" and the W. P. A. side, as I see it, are as follows:

1. Projects definitely relieve unemployment by placing men to work in their proper trades.

There are an estimated 40,000 people in Iowa who, because of lack of opportunity during the last 15 years, when no apprentices were hired in Iowa, are without skilled training and whom P. W. A. contractors will not hire. These must be trained somehow, and in the meantime, constituting the bulk of our unemployment load must be placed on jobs at which they can earn security wages.

2. One and one-half to three men are put to work indirectly for every one employed directly on construction site.

This is a debatable point, and even though true, as reflected in improved business conditions, still has not, and most certainly will not, solve the apparent permanent unemployment problem we have in this State.

3. Direct and indirect employment will equal at least 1,140,000 men employed per year at current wages and salaries.

Granting this figure to be true, there will remain a monthly average of 30,000 workers in Iowa who would not be taken care of by private contract work.

4. The per capita cost to the Federal Government per man employed per year will not exceed \$615, direct and indirect.

The per-capita cost of W. P. A. employees has been less than this amount during the last 6 months in Iowa, including all overhead.

5. Public Works projects materially stimulate industry by multiplying business value from two to three times the original transaction.

Worth-while public works built in your district, and which I again urge you to inspect when you return, have exactly the same effect.

6. Projects can soon be started and completed within a year.

Projects approved for P. W. A. a year ago are just starting in Iowa, and many have not yet been started. W. P. A. projects were started almost overnight.

7. Projects are economically sound, and of permanent nature.

Again I ask you to visit W. P. A. projects in your district and arrive at your own conclusion as to their soundness and permanency.

8. Projects constructed by contract yield \$100,000,000 in taxes to various governments, most of which would be lost if work done by Government agency.

Taxes affect all wage earners and all sellers of building materials. What is true here in connection with P. W. A. applies equally to W. P. A., whatever the figure may be.

9. P. W. A. is smooth-running organization having public confidence and noted for its integrity.

There has never been any question as to the integrity of W. P. A. in Iowa, and, if there were rough spots in the process

of putting 36,000 people to work on worth-while jobs in a period of weeks, certainly W. P. A. is a smooth-running organization in Iowa now.

10. Over 6,130 approved projects are on file. Projects submitted in good faith by political subdivisions scattered throughout the United States only to find funds were not available.

More than \$64,000,000 worth of projects in Iowa, asked for and sponsored by local subdivisions of government, have been approved by the President and the Comptroller General of the United States. (It might be noted here that, on the 45-55 grant basis under which P. W. A. operates, projects are possible only in those communities where local governments can raise the necessary 55 percent of costs. In at least 50 Iowa counties local governments cannot do this, and it is in these counties where unemployment loads are heaviest.)

11. When depression is over all of the public dollars expended will still be paying dividends in socially valuable, Nation-enriching works.

We believe the depression is over, and we also believe that, despite business recovery, a permanent unemployment load, particularly in the poorer counties, will be with us next year and for some years to come.

12. Sudden abandonment of P. W. A. now would kick the props out from under construction and affiliated industries, precipitating further unemployment.

Revision of regulations governing W. P. A. expenditures to permit the employment of some nonrelief, skilled workers would take care of whatever real element of fact lies in this statement.

In conclusion, may I reiterate that if we are to avoid confusion of past in meeting the Iowa unemployment problem, "earmarking" of funds appropriated for that purpose to agencies, which have proven that they cannot take care of it, must be avoided.

In another letter I shall discuss nonconstruction activities of W. P. A., pointing out those which have proven of value and those we think are unessential in taking care of unemployment.

Sincerely,

L. S. HILL, State Administrator.

The Clerk read as follows:

The President shall require to be paid such rates of pay for all persons engaged upon any project under the foregoing appropriation, as will, in the discretion of the President, accomplish the purposes of such appropriation and not adversely or otherwise tend to decrease the going rates of wages paid for work of a similar nature: *Provided*, That the President may fix different rates of wages for various types of work on any project, which rates need not be uniform throughout the United States.

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CONNERY: Page 22, strike out lines 9 to 17, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"The rates of pay for persons engaged upon any project under the foregoing appropriation shall be not less than the prevailing rates of pay for work of a similar nature as determined by the Works Progress Administrator, and in the employment of such persons upon such projects, preference shall be given to unemployed citizens of the United States residing in the community within which such project is carried on."

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order on that.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman should make the point of order.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I make the point of order, Mr. Chairman, on the last part of the amendment. We have already settled the question of citizenship.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule. The gentleman from Texas raises the point of order on that portion of the amendment which is as follows:

And in the employment of such persons upon such project, preference shall be given to unemployed citizens of the United States.

That portion of the amendment the Chair rules is not germane. The Chair, therefore, sustains the point of order.

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Chairman, I offer another amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CONNERY: Page 22, strike out lines 9 to 17, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"The rates of pay for persons engaged upon projects under the foregoing appropriation shall be not less than the prevailing rates of pay for work of a similar nature, as determined by the Works Progress Administrator."

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Chairman, this is what was known as the Connery-McCarran amendment on the original relief bill providing for \$4,800,000,000 that was passed last year. It is the same amendment which I introduced on the floor of the House at that time, which was defeated by a small vote. Then Senator McCARRAN put in the same amendment

in the Senate, and the Senate was held up in session 3 months on that proposition alone. The McCarran amendment finally was defeated in the Senate by a small vote. You will remember the result of the nonpassage of that Connery-McCarran amendment. There was a general strike threatened in the United States. In New York City at a mass meeting in Madison Square Garden it was suggested that there might be a general strike in the United States because of the resentment of organized labor due to the results of the wages paid on W. P. A.

I am striving, both for the sake of my own party as well as the whole country, to prevent any such recurrence of that situation in New York, Chicago, Atlanta, San Francisco, Detroit, Dallas, New Orleans, or anywhere else in the United States. The prevailing rate of wage is being paid in many instances on W. P. A. projects. It came as a result of the situation primarily in New York City, when General Johnson, who was W. P. A. administrator in New York City, brought it to the attention of the President and Mr. Hopkins that unless something was done in regard to that situation, unless the prevailing rate of wage was paid, we would have trouble, if not bloodshed, in New York City and in the large cities of the United States.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONNERY. Yes; I yield gladly to my friend from Texas.

Mr. BUCHANAN. As I understand it, the prevailing wage has been followed.

Mr. CONNERY. In many instances.

Mr. BUCHANAN. In many instances and in many places, but the length of time they gave employees at the prevailing wage only produced a total amount equal to a security wage.

Mr. CONNERY. Yes. In other words, in some cases they got 3 days' work at the prevailing rate of wage. I am perfectly willing to go along on those 3 days at the prevailing rate of wage, because that gives other men work at the prevailing rate of wage and keeps up the wage standard.

Mr. BUCHANAN. And 3 days' work at the prevailing rate is all they could earn in an entire week?

Mr. CONNERY. Yes. They would get, for instance, \$20 for working 3 days a week instead of working 6 days a week for \$20.

Mr. BUCHANAN. With the understanding that they will be paid the prevailing rate of wage, but that they will be employed only a sufficient number of days so that the total amount earned would be a security living, then we have no objection, with that understanding.

Mr. CONNERY. I am glad my friend accepts my amendment, and I congratulate the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee [Mr. BUCHANAN] upon doing a fine service both to our party and the entire Nation in accepting this amendment which means so much to the workers of the country.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

The Works Progress Administrator is authorized to prescribe such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of the foregoing appropriation.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LANHAM: Page 22, line 20, after the word "appropriation", strike out the period, insert a colon, and add the following: "*Provided, however*, That in the employment of persons on Works Progress Administration projects, applicants in actual need of such employment, whose names have not heretofore been placed on relief rolls, shall be given the same eligibility for employment as applicants whose names have heretofore appeared on such rolls."

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, there are in this country many classes of worthy people actually in need who today are not eligible for employment under Works Progress Administration projects. A number of them are those who have been unwilling to go on relief as long as it was possible to hold out on their own resources, and they have shown

the stamina of the old pioneers. There are many others who have been working in mills and factories, often on part-time, eking out a precarious existence, who have plodded along without relief on the little they were able to earn, but the closing of shops, mills, and factories placed some of them in actual need.

The present rules and regulations with reference to the employment of people on Works Progress Administration projects prescribe that they shall have been on the relief rolls for a certain length of time before they may be given this work. That is actually a discrimination against the man who has had sufficient stamina to fight it out to the best of his ability and earn his own way and make his own livelihood as long as he possibly could. Certainly these unfortunate men and women who now, at the end of their row, find themselves in need of employment should not be discriminated against in favor of those whose names were placed on relief rolls long ago. It is nothing but fair to the upstanding men and women of America who have gone on as long as possible under their own power that now, when they are in actual need, they be given the same eligibility with reference to employment as those who took advantage of relief in the first instance.

I hope the amendment will prevail. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, the question raised by the amendment, of course, is one that appeals to all of us. In the hearings you will find that Mr. Hopkins was asked specifically about this large group of citizens who, fighting a losing fight, tried to keep off the relief rolls and were not on the relief rolls, in the fall of 1935, when those rolls were frozen for the purposes of W. P. A. projects. Mr. Hopkins stated to our committee that his administration recognized the fact that there would have to be a restatement of the rules and entitlements to employment on W. P. A. projects.

I do not know exactly the form of the amendment, but the principle is good, and, speaking for myself, I have no objection to the amendment. If there is any administrative problem in it, that can be perfected in the other body.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM. I yield.

Mr. LANHAM. The amendment was hurriedly drawn, but it does state the principle that to me seems to be so fair that if it is not now in proper form it should be put in proper form in the other body.

Mr. WOODRUM. I have no objection to it.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, this is a matter for which I have been working and pleading very hard for a good many weeks because there have come to my attention so very many worthy cases that cannot get any kind of relief owing to the ruling of the W. P. A. Administrator. I believe the Members agree with me that the amendment should be adopted—the amendment of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM]. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Texas.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CHRISTIANSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CHRISTIANSON: Page 32, strike out lines 18, 19, and 20.

Mr. CHRISTIANSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment, in the first place, because on principle I am opposed to delegation of power; and, specifically in this instance, because I am opposed to the delegation of any power to the present head of the Works Progress Administration. The last man in the world to whom I would give a blank check for \$1,425,000,000 is Harry L. Hopkins. I have nothing against him personally; he is a charming gentleman. I do not impugn his motives; I am sure he is honorable. But Mr. Hopkins does not know the value of a dollar, and therefore is not the right person to whom to intrust the spending of billions of dollars. Although perhaps not personally actuated by political motives, he has shown a ready willingness to cooperate

with those who are, and a reluctance to interfere when proof of the use of relief funds to influence elections has been brought to his attention.

It is our responsibility to place proper restrictions upon the expenditure of the money we are now appropriating instead of writing a blank check. The people can talk back to us; they cannot talk back to Mr. Hopkins. We cannot talk back to him; if you think we can, try it. We did not hire him; we cannot fire him. Therefore, unless we want him to continue to run hog-wild, we must ourselves write the regulations by which he shall be governed, and write them into the law so that no New Deal ukase can repeal or modify them.

The bad judgment that has been used in the past in spending the billions appropriated for relief has become notorious. The administration has wasted the people's hard-earned money conducting research into the history of the safety-pin. To children who needed bread it has given eurythmic dancing. It erected a \$25,000 municipal dog kennel at Memphis, Tenn. It copied Chick Sales' designs and erected 600,000 outhouses at the expense of the Federal Treasury. It allocated \$500,000 for training housemaids, overlooking the probability that by the time Mr. Hopkins gets through spending the money there will be nobody left in the country who can afford to hire one.

While decrying rugged individualism, the administration induced a whole shipload of farmers to leave established communities in the agricultural Middle West to found a precarious colony in far-off ice-bound Alaska, where they will compete with the Eskimos in coaxing a precarious living from an unwilling soil.

It projected a timber belt in a part of the country where for countless ages nature had tried to make trees grow and had failed—as futile a gesture as that of the scoffer who spat at Olympus to show his contempt for the gods.

It picked up King Canute's discarded broom and undertook to control the tides of Passamaquoddy. The project was to cost scores of millions, and there was no market for electricity within several hundred miles; the situation was so unique that it could hardly serve even as a yardstick. But such considerations did not daunt the playboys who have billions of other people's money with which to play, and whose obsession is that they were born to reconstruct the world.

It undertook to dig a canal across Florida from the Atlantic coast to the Gulf of Mexico, at a cost running well into nine figures, and was checked in the grandiose scheme by indignant farmers, who, more far-sighted than the New Deal planners, realized that introducing salt sea water into the soil of the Everglades would destroy one of the most productive citrus-fruit growing regions in the world.

It exhausted half of a billion dollars of the Government's credit—credit that will be sorely needed for other and more vital needs before the sun goes down on the Roosevelt regime—in buying up the world's silver at two or three times the world's price, not to use it as a circulating medium but to put it in huge vaults constructed for its reception in the fastnesses of Kentucky. There, put back in the ground, it will be just as useful and no more so than it was in the ground from which it originally came. Hoisting the price of silver has depressed price levels in the Orient and wrecked the economy of China—but what of that? The juvenile passion for experiment, the desire to pick the clock to pieces to see what it is made of, has been satisfied. Somebody, some day, will put the wheels back, but it is common experience that a clock reassembled never runs the same again.

Surely this record of blundering incompetence should convince us of the necessity of resuming our responsibility and our duty to specify how the money we appropriate shall be spent. We should stop the official arrogance that caused \$238,000,000 of P. W. A. funds to be diverted to the Navy and put through the Reedsville project after Congress had turned it down.

Members of the majority who have spoken on this bill have been careful not to justify the mistakes of the administration. They have sought refuge in the plea that "to err is human", to which our answer is that it is not always true that "to forgive is divine." Very little has been said in

defense of boondoggling even though the President said that the word would be "enshrined in the hearts of the American people."

The strategy of the majority has been to try to make the people forget the tragedy of errors and the shameful record of shameless politicians who have profited from human misery by making the claim that there has been economic recovery.

Whether there has been recovery is beside the point. All depressions in the past have come to an end, and it has always been supposed that this one would. What the people are interested in knowing is why the present depression has lasted twice as long as former similar visitations; why we have still made less progress than England, Australia, Japan, and Scandinavia; whether such increase in the volume of business as we have had has not merely reflected Government spending and whether much of it will not disappear when the Government's ability to support business artificially is exhausted; and, finally, whether the improvement is not due to a better world situation and has been retarded rather than advanced by New Deal policies.

There is no occasion for joining in paeans of praise and singing "Happy Days Are Here Again" while 12,600,000 men are out of work and the Nation's relief roll is lengthening beyond 24,000,000 names. There is no cause for exulting in prosperity so long as one-fifth of American families have incomes of less than \$1.36 a day and another fifth of less than \$2.72.

There can be no recovery so long as Government deficits run from \$3,500,000,000 to \$6,000,000,000 a year, threatening not only crushing taxes but ultimate repudiation or inflation. Today the national debt is \$31,500,000,000; with contingent liabilities and the soldiers' bonus debt added it is \$39,000,000,000, and the end is not yet.

Thus far \$11,732,000,000 has been appropriated for relief, beside additional billions appropriated to the lending agencies of the Government. Much of it has been spent for wasteful projects which returned but little to labor. Huge sums have been paid out to political spoilsmen who, although in most cases utterly without experience, have been put in charge of relief activities. Other huge sums have been translated into profits. It has been estimated that on the whole perhaps not over one dollar in three has reached the pockets of those whom we have tried to help.

I submit the question how long the Government can stand the drain upon its resources imposed by such wasteful and profligate methods. The Treasury is not a bottomless barrel.

We may be forced eventually to resort exclusively to direct relief. It has been said that it destroys morale to be on the dole. Perhaps it does. Perhaps boondoggling destroys morale, and something else too. However, the argument that we save men's pride by giving work relief has lost its point since the administration put into effect the regulation that one must go on relief, and in effect take a pauper's oath, before he can become eligible to a work-relief job. In that connection I want to condemn with as vigorous words as I can command the order preventing those whose sense of personal dignity had caused them to stay off the relief rolls up to November 1 last, from getting relief jobs thereafter. That was punishing rugged individualism with a vengeance!

I shall vote for this bill, but only because a better measure is not offered. If I had my way there would be a census of the unemployed. That census would be taken by requiring every relief applicant to register for work at a Government employment agency. The Federal relief appropriation would then be apportioned among the States in proportion to the number of unemployed in each State, upon the condition that the States and their municipal subdivisions match every \$3 supplied by the Federal Government with one State dollar. I would turn the administration over to the States and municipalities, substituting State departments of public welfare, long established and functioning well, for the politically motivated and hastily improvised Federal agencies now in control. I would let the States adopt appropriate rules and regulations and take the responsibility, and make Harry Hopkins a bookkeeper.

I shall vote for this bill because so long as there is a single mouth in this country to be fed, a single body to be clothed, a single family to be housed, and a single home to be warmed, there lies upon the Federal Government a responsibility it must not and cannot shirk.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Minnesota.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have found in my experience here that I have always profited by "looking over the neighbor's fence" to ascertain his experience with any subject with which we are called upon to deal. This is especially true when the subject matter is new in our experience. Surely what the Congress is finding it necessary to do now with reference to millions of their helpless citizens is such an experience. The awful depression has been common to all intensely industrialized nations, including the great trilogy of States, Germany, Great Britain, and our own country. Under like general conditions, to what extent has each of these countries undertaken to shield its citizens against physical suffering and want?

Well, sir, I find that Germany expends a much larger amount, that the country over which the flag of Great Britain waves has been expending a much larger amount than we on this humane and Christian object. I find that during a 3-year period of comparison, in terms of our population, England expended \$10,815,300,000; Germany expended \$15,968,580,000, as compared with an expenditure of \$6,605,356,775 in the United States, including city, county, State, and Federal contributions, for these great purposes of public relief. The figures represent money payments to the unemployed, work projects initiated to employ them, pensions to the indigent and dependent aged. The gross payments to Great Britain exceeded ours during the period by 64 percent, while those of Germany also exceeded ours by 141 percent. In terms of the burden accepted in each country during this period, the annual burden in the United States was \$18.05 per capita of population; in England, \$29.55; and in Germany, \$43.63.

Mr. Chairman, I now present a table showing these payments in per-capita figures for each country and specifying the respective years involved.

Summary of public expenditures for social relief services in the United States, Great Britain, and Germany
(Dollars per capita)

	United States	Great Britain (converting at old par, 4.86)	Germany (converting at old par, 0.2385)
1935	\$23.24	\$29.26	
1934	20.81	28.94	\$32.84
1933	10.09	30.44	36.63
1932		30.36	44.29
1931		27.64	49.97
Annual average, 1933 to 1935	18.05	29.55	
Annual average, 1931 to 1933			43.63

Mr. Chairman, it is a common saying that misery loves company, and all surely find company for our financial miseries, if a comparison of expenditures for social-relief purposes is a test of misery. In no years has our highest burden been so high as their lowest burdens in the years of the depression. Nevertheless, it will be argued that an expenditure of \$6,605,356,775 during the 3 years 1933-35 is an egregious sum to ask, even for such a purpose. It is a large sum, I grant you. It should have been set aside in better times by adequate social-insurance systems. Corporate thrift did not fail to make such provision for its dependent investors.

I hold in my hand a statement showing the dividends paid in the United States during 4 years of the depression. Altogether, for the years 1930 to 1933, inclusive, \$21,214,925,000 have been paid. Of this sum, \$17,267,920,000 have been paid

by those companies out of their reserves built up from the profits of previous years. Compare this seventeen billions with the total sums paid in relief, including R. F. C. and Public Works, and the comparative numbers of people involved.

Sir, I do not think this fact should be taken as a matter of reproach to the employers of the country. It may have been high prudence on their part to have set aside some \$17,000,000,000 in the years of their good fortune to protect their stockholders when the day of misfortune should come. But when the charge of extravagant and needless expenditure is made as to our relief expenditures, I want to challenge it and say that if it was natural for these financiers to set aside \$17,000,000,000 of reserves to protect their stockholders it would be unnatural for us to overlook the millions of human beings in their employ who possessed no organized method of thrift which might control savings at their source. The practical circumstance, is this, that, with respect to the owners of our industrial system, boards of directors had control of the dividend funds at their source and were able to establish a system of enforced thrift for the stockholders. They did not put the question to a vote of the stockholders. They simply set the funds aside, from abundant profits, in the form of reserves.

Now, the workers were not in a position to control such funds at their source and say, "So much of this excess shall be set aside for our day of tribulation—for the day when they think our arms are not as swift as others to turn the great wheels of competitive industry."

Sir, I hope that very soon our industrial order, like the industrial orders which have preceded it, will act on its obligation to meet the primary needs of the human race dependent upon it. Previous systems have not denied such duties. Under the feudal system a place was found for the humblest villein. Even under slavery the owner failed not in his obligation to feed and clothe and doctor the slaves, no matter what might happen to crops or to markets. So long as it does not, and until it does, a less efficient and surely less satisfying Government assistance must be employed to meet these elemental needs. The world does not owe a man a living, I grant you, but it does owe him a chance to make a living; and it is the duty of our industrial order to so administer the employment asset that any man willing and competent to work may secure a just share of the employment available.

LIST OF APPENDICES

- I. Expenditures in Great Britain, 1930-35.
- II. Expenditures in Germany, 1929-34.
- III. Expenditures in the United States, 1933-35.
- IV. Corporate income and dividends in the United States, 1922-33.

APPENDIX I

Expenditures¹ for social services in Great Britain (England, Scotland, Wales), 1930-35

	Year ending Mar. 31					
	1930	1931	1932	1933	1934	1935 (estimated)
A. Unemployment and insurance acts.....	£53,300,000	£101,600,000	£122,800,000	£117,700,000	£101,500,000	£52,900,000
1. Insurance benefits ²						46,200,000
2. Transitional payments ³						36,800,000
B. Health insurance ⁴	38,600,000	38,600,000	37,500,000	37,500,000	36,000,000	36,800,000
C. Pensions.....	62,200,000	72,100,000	78,400,000	81,300,000	83,200,000	
1. Widows and orphans and old-age contributory pensions ⁵						43,200,000
2. Old-age pension acts ⁶						42,400,000
D. Poor relief ⁷	45,000,000	42,500,000	41,200,000	44,100,000	46,100,000	48,200,000
E. Public health acts ⁸	17,400,000	19,500,000	20,000,000	21,300,000	22,600,000	23,500,000
F. Working-class housing.....	35,600,000	40,400,000	42,300,000	44,300,000	44,800,000	44,000,000
Total.....	252,100,000	314,700,000	342,200,000	346,200,000	334,200,000	337,200,000
Total excluding housing (F).....	216,500,000	274,300,000	299,900,000	301,900,000	289,400,000	293,200,000
Total excluding public health (E) and housing (F).....	199,100,000	254,800,000	279,900,000	280,600,000	266,800,000	269,700,000
Dollars converted at \$4.86, total.....	\$1,225,200,000	\$1,529,400,000	\$1,663,100,000	\$1,682,500,000	\$1,624,200,000	\$1,638,800,000
Per capita ⁹	\$27.35	\$34.14	\$37.12	\$37.56	\$36.25	\$36.58
Total excluding housing.....	\$1,052,200,000	\$1,333,100,000	\$1,457,500,000	\$1,467,200,000	\$1,406,500,000	\$1,425,000,000
Per capita.....	\$23.49	\$29.76	\$32.53	\$32.75	\$31.40	\$31.81
Total excluding Public Health (E) and housing (F).....	\$967,600,000	\$1,238,300,000	\$1,360,300,000	\$1,363,700,000	\$1,296,600,000	\$1,310,700,000
Per capita.....	\$21.60	\$27.64	\$30.36	\$30.44	\$28.94	\$29.26

¹ Expenditures which come under public control. Includes contributions of employers and beneficiaries for insurance and pensions.

² Supported by the (1) state, the (2) employers, and the (3) registered employees in roughly equal proportions.

³ Paid entirely by the state.

⁴ Supported by the (1) state, the (2) employers, and the (3) beneficiary contributors.

⁵ Paid by state.

⁶ Paid by central and local governments.

⁷ Mostly by the central and local governments.

⁸ Population of Great Britain (England, Scotland, Wales), census of 1931, was 44,800,000.

NOTE.—The central and local governments combined contributed roughly 65 percent of the total expenditures for year ending Mar. 31, 1934.

EXPLANATORY REMARKS ON APPENDIX I

It should be emphasized that these data do not include private expenditures for relief and other social services. They include only expenditures under public control. However, in the case of Great Britain and other foreign countries, such expenditures include contributions of employers and beneficiaries to various insurance plans.

Thus the figures given in Appendix I are larger than the amounts actually paid out by the exchequer and local governments.

While the question may be debated, it is a tenable position, I think, to hold that contributions of employers and beneficiaries are a form of taxation and are, for our purpose, not different from other public expenditures.

Surely this is the case when the security or insurance program is compulsory. In the case of voluntary plans, the point is more questionable. But it can be pointed out that if the voluntary plan operates in lieu of a compulsory plan, then again there is justification for inclusion of such payments on the same basis.

There are three totals and three corresponding per-capita figures; the first includes all items listed, the second excludes Housing (F), and the third excludes both Housing (F) and Public Health (E).

In expenditures under the public-health acts there are items such as maternity aid and lunacy treatment, which doubtless should not be included, because they are not included in the data for the United States. But there is also included medical aid to poor and welfare work, which should be included, since relief expenditures in the United States covered similar services. The total under public health can be broken down, but unfortunately not in a manner to include only the items we want. Strict ac-

curacy is not possible in making such a broad comparison. But it would appear that the figure most comparable to the United States data is some place between the two lower per-capita figures; that is, between \$32.75 and \$30.44 for 1933.

As to the exchange rate, I am of the opinion that the old par presents the fairest picture for comparison. But it is a simple matter to convert on any basis wanted since all three totals are given in pounds.

A hostile critic can object with plausible reasons to any conceivable manner of conversion.

During the years of violent fluctuations, such as 1931, 1932, and 1933, I do not know how strict accuracy could be obtained in any average figure. But suppose, roughly, a figure of 3.75 for 1932, 5 for 1933, and 4.92 for 1934-35. Conversion at these different figures would present a changing picture of what the British are spending that is entirely false.

If conversion is made at the actual rate of recent months, the British expenditures are made to appear even higher.

In obtaining the per-capita expenditure the same population figure has been used for the different years, 122,000,000 for the United States, and 44,800,000 for Great Britain. If allowance were made for an increasing population, the per-capita figure would be slightly lower.

The sources for the data regarding foreign countries are: The Economist Budget Supplement, April 14, 1934, page 10; December 28, 1935, page 1308. Total Expenditures under Certain Acts of Parliament (official), November 1934-November 1935. International Survey of Social Services, 1933. Published by International Labor Office, 1936. World Economic Survey, 1933-34, 1934-35. Great Britain House of Commons Sessional Papers.

The most useful and reliable source is the official publication, *Total Expenditures under Certain Acts of Parliament*. In addition, the *Economist Budget Supplement* and the publication of the International Labor Office, *International Survey of Social Services*, 1933, were helpful.

Unemployment and Insurance Act (a) covers unemployment insurance acts 1920-33 and the large State assistance provided in the transitional payments scheme (National Economy Order No. 2) of 1931, revised 1934.

Health Insurance (B) is under the compulsory act of 1911, which was frequently amended, codified in 1924 and further amended in 1926, 1928, and 1932. The source of income is the contributions from employers and insured, State subsidy, and revenue from investments.

Pensions (C) include widows', orphans', and old-age contributory pensions (act of 1925). Income spent is from State subsidy and contributions of employers and insured. Also included are the noncontributory old-age and blind pensions subsidized entirely by the State (act of 1908, last amended 1929). Seamen and some public-utility employees have special plans.

In order to obtain data comparable to the British total excluding housing, expenditures under Public Works Administration (N. I. R. A. and act of 1935) were not included.

Item 5, Other Federal (act of 1935), covers funds allotted to other agencies for expenditures, such as Resettlement Administration, Commerce projects, Navy projects, etc.

The expenditures for the United States include not merely relief in the sense of direct grants but conservation work, education, and other valuable work. While men may differ as to the exact value of the conservation and educational work, it is indisputable that a vast return to the public welfare and public economy was secured.

The expenditures for Great Britain do not include similar returns. Subject to these limitations, the comparison between per-capita expenditures are: \$10.09 in the United States against \$30.44 to \$32.75 in Great Britain for 1933, \$20.81 in the United States against \$28.94 to \$31.40 in Great Britain for 1934, \$23.24 in the United States against \$29.26 to \$31.81 in Great Britain for 1935.

Due to the rapid change in expenditures for United States between 1933 and 1935, it is interesting to compare the average annual expenditure per capita for the 3-year period, 1933-35; for the United States it was \$18.05 against \$29.55 to \$31.99 for Great Britain.

Of course, there are some other factors which are relevant to this comparison we have made. For example, we have not dealt with the comparative cost of living between the two countries, nor with changes in the cost of living during the period covered.

Also the per-capita wealth and per-capita income has not been considered, although it might be argued that a wealthier country can well afford to spend more for social services. But the comparison at best is a rough one, and I doubt the prudence of too much refinement of data which in their nature are approximations.

APPENDIX II Expenditures for social services in Germany¹

	1934	1933	1932	1931	1930	1929
	<i>Reichsmarks</i>	<i>Reichsmarks</i>	<i>Reichsmarks</i>	<i>Reichsmarks</i>	<i>Reichsmarks</i>	<i>Reichsmarks</i>
Invalidity and survivors' insurance.....	1,220,200,000	1,178,283,000	3,293,900,000	4,095,300,000	1,475,400,000	1,324,300,000
Salaried workers' insurance.....	301,242,000	275,586,000	263,600,000	263,100,000	224,800,000	186,200,000
Miners' pensions.....	203,300,000	197,518,000	200,000,000	225,900,000	240,400,000	231,900,000
Unemployment relief.....	1,977,700,000	2,665,500,000	3,213,100,000	3,215,700,000	2,694,700,000	2,500,000,000
Unemployment insurance.....	1,358,851,000	1,758,633,000	874,536,000	1,530,592,000	1,799,877,000	1,372,200,000
Sickness insurance.....	1,260,000,000	1,180,900,000	1,210,000,000	1,666,400,000	1,010,000,000	2,219,300,000
Public welfare and youth aid.....	2,700,000,000	2,760,200,000	2,992,400,000	2,534,500,000	2,204,600,000	1,867,000,000
Total (reichsmarks).....	9,021,293,000	10,016,620,000	12,047,526,000	13,531,492,000	9,649,777,000	9,700,900,000
Total in dollars, converting at \$0.2385.....	\$2,151,578,381	\$2,388,963,870	\$2,873,334,951	\$3,227,260,842	\$2,301,471,815	\$2,313,664,650
Per-capita cost of social service ²	\$32.84	\$36.63	\$44.29	\$49.97	\$35.80	\$36.16
Total in dollars, converting at \$0.40336.....	\$3,638,828,744					
Per-capita cost of social service ³	\$55.54					

¹ Source: *Statistisches Jahrbuch des Deutschen Reich*, 1930-35. These expenditures come under public control. The following items include contributions from the Federal Government: Unemployment insurance; unemployment relief; invalidity, old-age, and survivors' insurance (for Federal employees on railways, for seamen and miners); general invalidity, old-age, and survivors' insurance. The other items are contributed by employers and beneficiaries only.

² Estimated.

³ Population: 1930, 64,280,000; 1931, 64,580,000 (estimated); 1932, 64,880,000 (estimated); 1933, 65,218,461; 1934, 65,518,000 (estimated).

EXPLANATORY REMARKS ON APPENDIX II

These data do not include private expenditures for social services. It is assumed in this table that contributions of employers and beneficiaries are a form of taxation and are, for our purpose, not different from other public expenditures. This is certainly the case when the security or insurance program is compulsory.

In no case are expenditures of individual or corporate philanthropies included.

There are two estimates in the data for Germany. Unemployment relief in 1929 was put at Rm. 2,500,000,000 on the supposition that the 1929 needs and expenditures were slightly below the corresponding figure for 1930. Public welfare and youth aid for 1934 was put at only a trifle less than the 1933 expenditure.

The expenditure for public welfare and youth aid was contributed in part by local governments.

The population estimates for Germany are based on the assumption that there was an annual increase of about 300,000 from 1930 to 1934. Only in the case of Germany has a different population been used in obtaining the per capita expenditure for the different years.

Converting at par the per-capita expenditure for social services in 1933 were Germany, \$36.63; United States, \$10.09; in 1934 Germany spent \$32.84 and the United States \$20.81.

Because 1935 data are not available for Germany, and because the United States expenditures increased rapidly from 1933 to 1935, it is interesting to compare the average annual expenditures per capita for the high 3-year period; it is United States, \$18.05 for 1933-35, and Germany, \$48.63 for 1931-33.

If conversion is made at the recent figure of \$0.40336, the German expenditures are increased more than 60 percent. This is shown for 1934, but is not used in the comparison.

APPENDIX III Total expenditures for relief, 1933-35

	3-year total 1933-35			1933		
	Total	Federal	State and local	Total	Federal	State and local
Emergency Relief.....	\$4,096,433,367	\$2,905,701,296	\$1,190,732,071	\$792,856,422	\$480,716,270	\$312,140,152
Civil Works Administration.....	938,000,000	847,952,000	90,048,000	221,144,943	199,915,028	21,229,915
Civilian Conservation Corps.....	1,093,840,000	1,093,840,000		217,344,000	217,344,000	
Works Progress Administration.....	316,856,061	256,653,410	60,202,651			
Other Federal (act of 1935).....	160,227,347	160,227,347				
Total costs.....	6,605,356,775	5,264,374,053	1,340,982,722	1,231,345,365	897,975,298	333,370,067
Total cost per capita.....	54.142			10.093		
Average cost per capita per annum.....	18.047					

	1934			1935		
	Total	Federal	State and local	Total	Federal	State and local
Emergency Relief.....	\$1,476,568,379	\$1,065,004,451	\$411,563,928	\$1,827,008,596	\$1,359,980,575	\$467,027,991
Civil Works Administration.....	716,855,057	648,036,972	68,818,085			
Civilian Conservation Corps.....	345,545,000	345,545,000		530,951,000	530,951,000	
Works Progress Administration.....				316,856,061	256,653,410	60,202,651
Other Federal (act of 1935).....				160,227,347	160,227,347	
Total costs.....	2,538,968,436	2,058,586,423	480,382,013	2,835,042,974	2,307,812,332	527,230,642
Total cost per capita.....	20.811			23.238		

EXPLANATORY REMARKS ON APPENDIX III

Appendix III does not include the small amounts paid in old-age pensions by the State and county governments. Since similar expenditures were included for foreign countries (in their case the contributions were by the central government), these items

should be included. However, their inclusion does not materially change the comparison as the following data show:

The expenditures of State and local governments in the United States for old-age pensions were \$16,173,207 in 1931, and \$31,192,492 in 1934. On a per-capita basis this amounts to \$0.13 in

1931 and \$0.26 in 1934. The corresponding figure for 1935 is definitely not yet available, but my guess is that it will be at least 20 percent above the 1934 figure.

The result is to increase the per-capita expenditure in the United States by \$0.26 from \$20.81 to \$21.07 for 1934. The 1935 figure of \$23.24 would be increased by a somewhat larger amount.

Railroad and private pension plans are not included because no expenditures under private control were included in the data for foreign countries. Only expenditures under public control were included for the purpose of the comparison.

There were no expenditures under the Social Security Act in 1935 except small allotments covered under W. P. A. funds.

Since British expenditures for housing were not included, the P. W. A. (N. I. R. A. and act of 1935) expenditures were not included.

The following is a brief identification of the agencies referred to in appendix III:

EMERGENCY RELIEF AND WORK PROGRAMS

I. Federal Emergency Relief Administration (F. E. R. A.): Two main types of relief have been provided by the Federal Emergency Relief Administration since its organization in May of 1933. These are direct relief and work relief. Under both the direct- and work-relief programs F. E. R. A. granted funds to the States to aid the States in caring for their destitute unemployed. The funds once granted became the property of the States, subject only to certain general Federal requirements necessary in order to insure the proper use of Federal money.

Direct relief under this program was given to the destitute jobless in the form of an outright gift of money or goods. No service or work was required of the relief recipient. The amount of money or goods given each relief client was determined by the degree of need of each relief case as discovered after detailed investigation by social-service workers. Thus a man with a large family of dependents would need and receive a larger amount of relief than that needed or received by a single person. Direct relief is thus comparable to the "dole" in England. The number of resident cases (families and single persons) receiving direct relief ranged from nearly 2,000,000 to a peak of over 3,400,000 a month, the latter number reached in March 1934.

Work relief under F. E. R. A. was granted in a manner similar to that of direct relief, but wages paid for work performed were substituted for outright gifts. Work relief thus possessed the advantages over direct relief of aiding in the maintenance of the worker's skill and morale and of providing the community with useful services. However, the amount any worker could earn on work relief was, like direct relief, limited by his budgetary need for bare living. Hourly wages were paid at the prevailing level, as determined by local committees in each community, but the number of hours of work each week varied with the need of each relief worker. The type of work performed by relief workers under this program varied widely in order to meet the varying needs of the widely different occupational experience of the relief workers. The projects were largely light construction ones although non-construction ones were provided for women and white-collar workers. In any case, the emphasis was on the relief of destitution among the unemployed rather than on the value of the completed projects. Material costs in relation to labor costs were kept at the lowest level practicable. The number of resident cases receiving work relief varied from 1,500,000 to more than 2,400,000 persons a month, the latter number being employed in January 1935.

II. Civil Works Administration (C. W. A.): The Civil Works Administration began operations in the middle of November 1933 and practically stopped operations in the first week of April 1934. The C. W. A. program provided work for more than 4.1 million persons at its peak in January 1934, but it differed from work relief under the F. E. R. A. in several important respects. C. W. A. was a Federal program and the workers on it were Federal employees, whereas both direct and work relief were essentially State programs helped with Federal funds. Wages on C. W. A. were paid at prevailing hourly wage rates and the number of hours of work per week was a flat amount applicable to all workers of a particular type regardless of variations in the amount of individual need for income. No investigation by social-service workers was required for C. W. A. employment. Of the 4,000,000 persons employed on C. W. A. at the peak about 2,000,000 were taken directly from F. E. R. A. relief rolls and 2,000,000 from the unemployed not receiving relief. Projects carried on under C. W. A. were of a wide variety of types designed to meet the occupational needs and abilities of the unemployed. The major emphasis was on giving jobs to the unemployed rather than on the value of the completed projects. The projects covered both construction and nonconstruction occupations, the construction projects being chiefly on the lighter type of projects which could be completed quickly and which did not require heavy expenditures for materials.

III. Emergency conservation work (C. C. C.): The emergency conservation work, which directs the Civilian Conservation Corps (C. C. C.), was created in March 1933 to provide employment in a healthful outdoor atmosphere for war veterans and for young men from relief families. Unemployed unmarried youths between the ages of 17 and 28 are enrolled in forest camps to do work of a conservation and reforestation nature. Enrollees are given room, board, clothing, and medical attention free in addition to a basic cash allowance of \$30 a month, of which about \$25 is sent home to aid in the support of their dependents. Employment on C. C. C. reached a peak of nearly 600,000 enrollees and other employees in August 1935.

IV. Public Works Administration (P. W. A.): The Public Works Administration was organized under the provisions of the National Industrial Recovery Act in June 1933, and continued under the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1935. By making loans and/or grants to other Federal agencies and to non-Federal public bodies, P. W. A. provides for the construction of heavy engineering types of projects. Unlike F. E. R. A., C. W. A., and W. P. A., in which the emphasis is on providing a living to the needy unemployed, the emphasis in P. W. A. is on the value of the completed project and the "pump priming" of private industry. P. W. A. carries on types of projects such as the construction of dams, roads, low-cost housing, school buildings, and other public buildings of all sorts, on which the cost of materials in relation to the cost of labor is high.

P. W. A. (under the N. I. R. A.) differs from F. E. R. A. and W. P. A. in that it sets up no relief standards. No investigation of need is made, any unemployed worker is eligible for a job. Prevailing wages, rather than "security wages", are paid. Under the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1935, however, P. W. A. is required, like the other agencies participating in the works program, to employ chiefly workers from the relief rolls. Employment on P. W. A. projects reached a peak of slightly more than 600,000 in July 1934.

V. Works Progress Administration (W. P. A.): The Works Progress Administration was organized under the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1935 to provide the bulk of employment for the existing 3,500,000 employable relief persons. W. P. A. is replacing the work-relief program under the F. E. R. A.; the direct relief of unemployables formerly cared for by F. E. R. A. is being transferred back to the States. W. P. A. differs from the old F. E. R. A. work relief in that the amount of wage payments to workers are based on occupational and geographical differences rather than on the budgetary deficiency of each worker. Also, W. P. A., like C. W. A., extends the area of Federal control to provide for much closer supervision of Federal funds than existed under F. E. R. A. W. P. A. employees are Federal employees and all expenditures are made directly from the Federal Treasury. W. P. A. differs from P. W. A. in that W. P. A. pays a security wage, averaging about \$50 a month, whereas P. W. A. pays prevailing wages. A more important difference, however, lies in the type of projects carried on. P. W. A. carries on heavy, expensive engineering construction projects which take a relatively long period to get into operation and to complete, and in which the cost of materials is high relative to the cost of labor. The emphasis in P. W. A. operations is on the value of the completed project in terms of capital additions to the country rather than on the provision of jobs to the maximum number of unemployed. W. P. A., on the other hand, carries on both nonconstruction and construction jobs to fit the occupational characteristics of the unemployed. The construction projects, which constitute the larger portion of W. P. A. projects, are of a lighter type that require less time to get under way and to complete and in which the cost of materials is relatively small compared to the cost of labor. W. P. A. emphasizes the need for providing the maximum number of socially useful jobs within the limits of the available funds rather than the value of the completed projects. W. P. A. carries on such construction projects as the construction of farm-to-market roads, of parks, playgrounds, swimming pools, airports, and repairs and improvements to all types of public buildings. At the peak of W. P. A. employment in February 1936 more than 3,000,000 workers were employed on W. P. A. projects.

APPENDIX IV

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
BUREAU OF FOREIGN AND DOMESTIC COMMERCE,
Washington, April 13, 1935.

To: R. B. Harris, Committee on Economic Security.
From: H. Gordon Hayes, Chief, Division of Economic Research.
Subject: Data for Congressman Lewis re corporate income and dividends.

Profits, cash dividends, and surpluses of all corporations

[Statistics of Income, Bureau of Internal Revenue, Treasury Department]

	Compiled net profit less income tax	Cash dividends paid	Balance after cash dividends paid
1933 ¹	\$469,000,000	\$2,976,000,000	\$3,445,000,000
1932	4,115,377,000	3,885,601,000	8,000,977,000
1931	1,175,596,000	6,151,083,000	7,326,679,000
1930	3,947,005,000	8,202,241,000	4,255,236,000
1929	10,676,071,000	8,355,662,000	2,320,409,000
1928	9,552,604,000	7,073,723,000	2,478,881,000
1927	7,538,372,000	6,423,176,000	1,115,196,000
1926	8,280,642,000	5,945,293,000	2,335,349,000
1925	8,146,052,000	5,189,475,000	2,956,577,000
1924	5,913,602,000	4,338,823,000	1,574,779,000
1923	6,697,157,000	4,169,118,000	2,528,039,000
1922	5,183,000,000	3,437,000,000	1,746,000,000

¹ Estimates for columns 2 and 3 for 1933 derived by applying to the Treasury data herein for 1932 the estimated percentage changes of "net dividends paid" and of "corporate losses" from 1932 to 1933 as computed in the national income study by the Division of Economic Research, Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, and for column 1 by subtracting the derived figure for column 2 from column 3.

² Deficit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Any person who knowingly and with intent to defraud the United States makes any false statement in connection with any application for any project, employment, or relief aid under the foregoing appropriation, or diverts, or attempts to divert, or assists in diverting for the benefit of any person or persons not entitled thereto, any portion of the foregoing appropriation, or any services or real or personal property acquired thereunder, or who knowingly, by means of any fraud, force, threat, intimidation, or boycott, deprives any person of any of the benefits to which he may be entitled under the foregoing appropriation, or attempts so to do, or assists in so doing, shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and fined not more than \$2,000 or imprisoned not more than 1 year, or both.

Mr. BACON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BACON: On page 23, line 7, after the word "doing", strike out the comma and insert the following: "; or any administrative officer of the Works Progress Administration who shall influence or attempt to influence, through fear or intimidation, the vote of any person who is an applicant for, or who receives, relief or work relief under the provisions of this act, in connection with any election at which Presidential and Vice Presidential electors or a Senator or Representative in, or a Delegate or Resident Commissioner to, Congress are to be voted for; or who violates or consents to the violation of the provisions of this paragraph, shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and fined not more than \$2,000 or imprisoned not more than 1 year, or both."

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. BACON] is not germane.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York desire to be heard?

Mr. BACON. Mr. Chairman, this covers individuals who may be guilty of intent to defraud or who knowingly by means of any fraud, force, threat, intimidation, or boycott deprives any person of any of the benefits to which he may be entitled, and so forth.

I merely add to the list of people mentioned in this section another clause, namely, that if any one of the administrators of this fund shall by intimidation or threat try to influence a man's vote he shall also come within the penalties provided for in this section.

Mr. WOODRUM. That is the provision which makes it not germane, because the penalty provided in here is against a person who undertakes to prevent the application of these funds. The gentleman brings in an entirely different matter and sets up an offense and provides a penalty for something entirely separate from this and not provided for in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule.

The paragraph to which the amendment has been offered relates to fraud against the United States. The amendment offered by the gentleman from New York relates to an entirely different subject. For this reason the Chair rules the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. BACON] is not germane and sustains the point of order.

Mr. BACON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks on the particular amendment I have just offered and which has been declared out of order by the Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BACON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that in the revision of my remarks which I made this morning I may include certain documents that I referred to in those remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Municipal architect's office: For an additional amount for personal services, fiscal year 1936, \$566.

Mr. MAVERICK. Mr. Chairman, I did not hear page 25 read, and I ask unanimous consent to return to that page for the purpose of offering an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAVERICK. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. MAVERICK: Page 25, line 6, strike out all of lines 6 to 18, inclusive.

Mr. MAVERICK. Mr. Chairman, I hope to win this particular fight, and I am serious about it. I want the Members to listen so they may know to what this amendment refers. At the present time the Senate confirms the holders of jobs paying \$5,000 or more. The Constitution of the United States does not have any such requirement, but it does say that all other officers in certain cases shall be approved by the Senate, and so forth.

Mr. Chairman, I do not see any reason why when we make an appropriation, and we go ahead and make the appropriation for the people of the United States, that we should then let the Senate control how that money should be spent. That is not done in any other parliamentary body on the face of the earth.

What is the Congress? The Congress has been considered, and sometimes rightfully so, as a door mat, and particularly of the other body.

I am not speaking disrespectfully of the other body, but why should we give the Senate of the United States the right to pass on all of these matters? I understand there is bound to be a certain amount of partisanship here, but I want the Republicans to listen also. At the present time the Democratic Senators control relief; in any event, Congress in this respect has little power. If the Republican Party should ever get into power, then the Republican Senators would have that power.

Mr. Chairman, the point I am making is that from a non-partisan viewpoint and from the viewpoint of the Republicans on that side and the Democrats on this side, we, as Representatives of the people and with parliamentary self-respect, should not give this power to the Senate. What is the result going to be if we do not give them this power? The result will be that if a Congressman goes down there and says something to Harry Hopkins or the President, he may get some attention, and I imagine Hopkins and the President will be glad of it. What happens now? You go down to see Mr. Hopkins and he says, "I cannot pay any attention to you because a Senator said so and so." The Senate controls the matter. We go ahead and give away our powers. We abrogate our powers and throw them into the lap of the Senate. Why?

Mr. Chairman, I ask for a favorable vote on the amendment I have just offered.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I hope the committee will not adopt this amendment. This identical amendment caused the bill to be held in conference last year for a long, long time. The Senate will put the provision in the bill anyway and will not recede.

Mr. MAVERICK. Why should they have that right any more than we should have it? Let us stand up for our rights here.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I am not going to cause the defeat of this bill with the resulting effects upon the suffering people of the country over the question of whether or not the Senate shall confirm one or two or half a dozen appointees of the President.

We have taken great pains in drawing this provision. If you will read the language you will see the Senate will have the right of confirming only those administrators who will be appointed, in addition to the ones they now have, and they now have them all over the Nation.

Mr. MAVERICK. Why should we surrender in advance to the Senate? Why should we give up the fight and run away in advance?

Mr. BUCHANAN. We are putting something substantial in here that your conferees can stand on, and not only can stand on but will stand on.

Mr. MAVERICK. We ought to stand up for equal parliamentary rights.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I hope you will not adopt this amendment so that when the bill goes to conference we will have no trouble about getting an agreement and passing the bill, because there are many items in the bill seriously needed now.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAVERICK].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MAVERICK) there were—ayes 23, noes 47.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Printing and binding: For an additional amount for printing and binding for the Department of Labor, including the same objects specified under this head in the Department of Labor Appropriation Act, 1936, \$10,000.

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. Chairman, appropriations for the Department of Labor should be increased. This will aid the activities of this Department in government. Anything along this line, I believe, deserves the support of the House. Whatever aid is given labor in this bill can very well be further expanded. I have always supported this sort of activity. We need the machinery for employing more people. The unemployment problem is pressing. However, the employment provided should be spread, not piled up by overtime on a few, as proposed in one section.

LUNDEEN BUREAU OF UNEMPLOYMENT BILL

Back in 1918 and 1919 I engaged in some activities along this line. On January 2, 1919, I introduced a bill to create a bureau of unemployed in the Department of Labor. On November 21, 1918, 10 days after the armistice was signed, I introduced a resolution directing certain committees of the House to provide work for the unemployed. Our returning veterans were not provided for and my bill sought to aid our unemployed, including our unemployed veterans. We had hearings before the House Rules Committee in December of that year. Had this resolution been passed by Congress it would have given us surveys and intelligent national planning for the handling of unemployment.

LOUISIANA LEGISLATURE ENDORSES FRAZIER-LUNDEEN SOCIAL-SECURITY BILL

The Legislature of the State of Louisiana has recently memorialized Congress to pass the Frazier-Lundeen social-security bill.

Of the young people who have reached working age since the depression began, nearly four and a half million are looking for work, according to the American Federation of Labor. The American Federation of Labor estimates that even if business again reaches normal there will be a job shortage of more than 7,000,000. Giving work relief at relief wages does not solve the problem. Millions of American citizens will not indefinitely submit to enforced poverty. This country is able to produce enough to furnish all its citizens an American standard of living. The Frazier-Lundeen bill is the only adequate social-security measure before Congress today.

UNEMPLOYMENT STILL OVER 12,000,000

Here are the latest unemployment figures of the Alexander Hamilton Institute.

ALEXANDER HAMILTON INSTITUTE ON UNEMPLOYMENT

These Hamilton Institute estimates for 1935 and 1936 are more recent estimates than those for the years 1929 through 1934. Slight changes are made in unemployment estimates from time to time as additional information becomes available. For instance, the American Federation of Labor estimates published last year are higher for the year 1933 than the estimates published this year for the year 1933. The American Federation of Labor has revised its estimates on the basis of additional information secured from Government sources. This must be remembered in comparing these various unemployment tables:

Alexander Hamilton Institute, Astor Pl., New York City, unemployment calculation—Total unemployment

Date	January	February	March	April	May	June
1929	5,223,000	5,050,000	4,514,000	3,947,000	3,476,000	3,089,000
1930	5,450,000	5,689,000	5,803,000	5,552,000	5,719,000	6,197,000
1931	10,278,000	10,387,000	10,318,000	9,992,000	10,083,000	10,314,000
1932	13,760,000	13,879,000	14,063,000	14,314,000	14,734,000	15,137,000
1933	16,358,000	16,393,000	16,814,000	16,391,000	16,037,000	15,291,000
1934	14,154,000	13,621,000	13,044,000	12,668,000	12,398,000	12,469,000
1935	13,833,000	13,454,000	13,231,000	12,904,000	12,935,000	12,939,000
1936	13,087,000	13,087,000	12,723,000	12,263,000		

Date	July	August	September	October	November	December
1929	2,942,000	2,624,000	2,539,000	2,485,000	3,319,000	4,034,000
1930	6,848,000	7,430,000	7,507,000	7,730,000	8,474,000	8,982,000
1931	10,902,000	11,286,000	11,323,000	11,657,000	12,254,000	12,519,000
1932	15,663,000	15,650,000	15,047,000	14,879,000	15,294,000	15,423,000
1933	14,727,000	13,707,000	12,913,000	12,810,000	13,235,000	13,352,000
1934	13,161,000	13,281,000	13,506,000	13,244,000	13,430,000	13,012,000
1935	13,166,000	13,019,000	12,677,000	12,265,000	12,414,000	12,032,000

American Federation of Labor estimates—Unemployment

	1929	1930	1931	1932
January	3,059,956	3,918,821	8,168,565	11,925,928
February	3,118,695	4,285,664	8,273,844	12,168,500
March	2,560,310	4,323,460	8,132,616	12,386,722
April	2,042,733	4,048,082	7,814,975	12,519,466
May	1,753,812	3,755,728	7,810,918	13,004,050
June	1,447,233	3,904,856	7,893,943	13,372,506
July	1,214,446	4,440,548	8,366,004	13,792,562
August	1,063,789	4,918,702	8,759,801	13,967,695
September	613,751	4,983,411	8,846,086	13,458,328
October	910,479	5,525,036	9,483,526	13,415,173
November	1,948,856	6,292,871	10,410,483	13,925,102
December	2,628,841	6,840,827	10,888,796	14,239,800
Average	1,864,000	4,770,000	8,738,000	13,182,000

	1933	1934	1935	1936
January	15,166,257	13,382,017	13,058,215	12,646,000
February	15,318,760	12,963,972	12,763,898	12,570,000
March	15,652,887	12,420,405	12,608,127	12,183,000
April	15,124,843	12,003,888	12,379,077	11,506,000
May	14,615,041	11,710,839	12,382,251	
June	13,842,917	11,714,342	12,388,872	
July	13,457,981	12,222,339	12,475,340	
August	12,661,641	12,361,763	12,218,500	
September	11,853,695	12,428,580	11,788,544	
October	11,842,483	12,212,690	11,448,986	
November	12,374,395	12,580,535	11,483,237	
December	12,759,623	12,358,989	11,396,875	
Average	13,723,000	12,364,000	12,199,000	

Unemployment estimates¹ (Robert Nathan)

Month	1929	1930	1931	1932
January	2,631,000	4,065,000	8,049,000	11,462,000
February	2,913,000	4,424,000	8,334,000	11,834,000
March	2,860,000	4,644,000	8,280,000	12,180,000
April	2,217,000	4,386,000	8,075,000	12,420,000
May	1,817,000	4,299,000	8,024,000	12,837,000
June	1,520,000	4,161,000	8,026,000	13,119,000
July	1,042,000	4,196,000	7,971,000	13,425,000
August	649,000	4,782,000	8,434,000	13,608,000
September	907,000	5,040,000	8,743,000	13,118,000
October	492,000	5,481,000	9,138,000	12,834,000
November	1,853,000	6,507,000	9,925,000	13,204,000
December	2,831,000	6,956,000	10,614,000	13,587,000
Average	1,813,000	4,921,000	8,634,000	12,803,000

Month	1933	1934	1935	1936
January	14,492,000	12,599,000	12,561,000	11,687,000
February	14,597,000	12,072,000	12,358,000	11,379,000
March	15,071,000	11,577,000	12,183,000	11,140,000
April	14,714,000	11,161,000	11,807,000	
May	14,341,000	10,897,000	11,618,000	
June	13,528,000	10,743,000	11,446,000	
July	12,839,000	10,967,000	11,373,000	
August	12,111,000	11,382,000	11,103,000	
September	11,448,000	11,908,000	10,915,000	
October	11,176,000	11,597,000	10,606,000	
November	11,738,000	11,996,000	10,738,000	
December	12,046,000	12,085,000	10,640,000	
Average	13,176,000	11,582,000	11,446,000	

¹ Estimates made for the Committee on Economic Security.

Unemployment estimates—National Industrial Conference Board, 247 Park Ave., New York City

	1930	1931	1932	1933	1934	1935	1936
January.....		6,067,000	9,996,000	12,755,000	10,538,000	10,142,000	9,801,000
February.....		6,794,000	10,103,000	12,782,000	9,873,000	9,885,000	9,850,000
March.....		6,799,000	10,293,000	12,300,000	9,394,000	9,752,000	9,649,000
April.....	13,188,000	6,661,000	10,754,000	12,993,000	9,318,000	9,621,000	
May.....	3,245,000	6,842,000	11,090,000	12,699,000	9,201,000	9,709,000	
June.....	3,678,000	7,165,000	11,596,000	12,034,000	9,252,000	9,749,000	
July.....	4,321,000	7,673,000	12,152,000	11,584,000	9,826,000	10,121,000	
August.....	4,590,000	7,939,000	12,207,000	10,731,000	9,990,000	9,852,000	
September.....	4,502,000	8,044,000	11,850,000	9,920,000	10,393,000	9,432,000	
October.....	4,777,000	8,473,000	11,691,000	9,924,000	10,057,000	9,188,000	
November.....	5,404,000	9,001,000	11,996,000	10,398,000	10,209,000	9,197,000	
December.....	5,674,000	9,182,000	12,113,000	10,334,000	9,740,000	8,979,000	
Average.....	14,375,000	7,603,000	11,320,000	11,621,000	9,816,000		

¹ United States Census of Unemployment. Classes A and B.² 9-month average.

Reference: Annalist.

Cleveland Trust Co., Cleveland, Ohio, unemployment estimates, 1930-35

	Construction		Other durable		Consumption goods		Providers of services		Total	
	Employed	Unem- ployed	Employed	Unem- ployed	Employed	Unem- ployed	Employed	Unem- ployed	Employed	Unem- ployed
1930										
January.....	2,556,000	954,000	5,660,000	996,000	14,562,000	249,000	21,412,000	640,000	44,190,000	2,839,000
February.....	2,502,000	1,012,000	5,648,000	1,015,000	14,547,000	279,000	21,087,000	987,000	43,784,000	3,293,000
March.....	2,580,000	937,000	5,635,000	1,034,000	14,459,000	381,000	21,001,000	1,095,000	43,675,000	3,447,000
April.....	2,844,000	677,000	5,629,000	1,047,000	14,400,000	455,000	21,109,000	1,009,000	43,982,000	3,188,000
May.....	2,980,000	544,000	5,573,000	1,110,000	14,326,000	544,000	21,023,000	1,117,000	43,902,000	3,315,000
June.....	3,058,000	470,000	5,430,000	1,259,000	14,267,000	618,000	20,828,000	1,334,000	43,583,000	3,681,000
July.....	3,152,000	379,000	5,187,000	1,509,000	14,178,000	721,000	20,655,000	1,529,000	43,172,000	4,138,000
August.....	3,098,000	437,000	5,050,000	1,652,000	14,223,000	691,000	20,353,000	1,853,000	42,724,000	4,633,000
September.....	2,963,000	575,000	4,975,000	1,734,000	14,400,000	529,000	20,547,000	1,680,000	42,885,000	4,518,000
October.....	2,865,000	677,000	4,885,000	1,828,000	14,282,000	661,000	20,504,000	1,745,000	42,539,000	4,911,000
November.....	2,560,000	985,000	4,726,000	1,996,000	14,090,000	868,000	20,331,000	1,940,000	41,707,000	5,789,000
December.....	2,258,000	1,291,000	4,596,000	2,133,000	13,957,000	1,016,000	21,001,000	1,292,000	41,812,000	5,732,000
1931										
January.....	1,849,000	1,703,000	4,396,000	2,339,000	13,853,000	1,135,000	19,381,000	2,934,000	39,479,000	8,111,000
February.....	1,913,000	1,643,000	4,402,000	2,340,000	13,868,000	1,134,000	19,100,000	3,237,000	39,283,000	8,354,000
March.....	1,991,000	1,568,000	4,409,000	2,340,000	13,883,000	1,134,000	19,100,000	3,259,000	39,283,000	8,301,000
April.....	2,052,000	1,511,000	4,421,000	2,334,000	13,883,000	1,149,000	19,316,000	3,065,000	39,672,000	8,059,000
May.....	2,333,000	1,233,000	4,365,000	2,397,000	13,824,000	1,222,000	19,273,000	3,130,000	39,795,000	7,962,000
June.....	2,441,000	1,129,000	4,253,000	2,515,000	13,735,000	1,326,000	19,208,000	3,216,000	39,637,000	8,186,000
July.....	2,445,000	1,128,000	4,104,000	2,671,000	13,720,000	1,356,000	18,929,000	3,517,000	39,198,000	8,672,000
August.....	2,363,000	1,214,000	4,010,000	2,772,000	13,809,000	1,282,000	18,646,000	3,822,000	38,828,000	9,090,000
September.....	2,286,000	1,294,000	3,967,000	2,821,000	13,927,000	1,178,000	18,819,000	3,671,000	38,999,000	8,964,000
October.....	2,184,000	1,399,000	3,811,000	2,984,000	13,779,000	1,341,000	18,540,000	3,672,000	38,614,000	9,396,000
November.....	1,971,000	1,616,000	3,718,000	3,083,000	13,573,000	1,561,000	18,581,000	3,952,000	37,843,000	10,212,000
December.....	1,700,000	1,890,000	3,674,000	3,134,000	13,500,000	1,649,000	19,229,000	3,326,000	38,103,000	9,999,000
1932										
January.....	1,530,000	2,064,000	3,531,000	3,284,000	13,381,000	1,783,000	17,911,000	4,667,000	36,353,000	11,798,000
February.....	1,453,000	2,144,000	3,549,000	3,272,000	13,410,000	1,768,000	17,069,000	5,030,000	35,481,000	12,714,000
March.....	1,412,000	2,189,000	3,475,000	3,353,000	13,366,000	1,827,000	17,522,000	5,099,000	35,775,000	12,468,000
April.....	1,493,000	2,111,000	3,363,000	3,471,000	13,203,000	2,005,000	17,501,000	5,142,000	35,660,000	12,729,000
May.....	1,632,000	1,976,000	3,263,000	3,578,000	13,011,000	2,211,000	17,350,000	5,315,000	35,256,000	13,080,000
June.....	1,666,000	1,945,000	3,145,000	3,703,000	12,864,000	2,373,000	17,155,000	5,632,000	34,830,000	13,553,000
July.....	1,703,000	1,912,000	3,008,000	3,846,000	12,731,000	2,521,000	16,745,000	5,964,000	34,187,000	14,243,000
August.....	1,747,000	1,871,000	2,920,000	3,941,000	12,967,000	2,300,000	16,464,000	6,266,000	34,098,000	14,378,000
September.....	1,808,000	1,814,000	2,945,000	3,922,000	13,292,000	1,989,000	16,658,000	6,094,000	34,703,000	13,819,000
October.....	1,751,000	1,874,000	2,964,000	3,910,000	13,395,000	1,901,000	16,766,000	6,008,000	34,876,000	13,693,000
November.....	1,629,000	2,000,000	2,977,000	3,904,000	13,277,000	2,034,000	16,615,000	6,181,000	34,498,000	14,119,000
December.....	1,388,000	2,244,000	2,927,000	3,960,000	13,189,000	2,136,000	16,766,000	6,052,000	34,270,000	14,392,000
1933										
January.....	1,317,000	2,319,000	2,805,000	4,089,000	13,115,000	2,225,000	16,118,000	6,722,000	33,555,000	15,355,000
February.....	1,277,000	2,362,000	2,833,000	4,067,000	13,159,000	2,196,000	15,902,000	6,960,000	33,171,000	15,585,000
March.....	1,253,000	2,390,000	2,727,000	4,190,000	12,997,000	2,373,000	15,708,000	7,176,000	32,685,000	16,119,000
April.....	1,341,000	2,305,000	2,759,000	4,155,000	13,071,000	2,314,000	16,053,000	6,854,000	33,224,000	15,628,000
May.....	1,449,000	2,201,000	2,908,000	4,013,000	13,174,000	2,226,000	16,032,000	6,897,000	33,503,000	15,337,000
June.....	1,531,000	2,073,000	3,120,000	3,808,000	13,410,000	2,006,000	16,291,000	6,661,000	34,402,000	14,548,000
July.....	1,537,000	2,120,000	3,363,000	3,572,000	13,661,000	1,770,000	16,248,000	6,727,000	34,809,000	14,189,000
August.....	1,561,000	2,100,000	3,643,000	3,299,000	13,912,000	1,534,000	16,680,000	6,318,000	35,796,000	13,251,000
September.....	1,635,000	2,029,000	3,830,000	3,118,000	14,149,000	1,312,000	17,242,000	5,779,000	36,856,000	12,238,000
October.....	1,734,000	1,934,000	3,836,000	3,119,000	14,119,000	1,358,000	17,479,000	5,665,000	37,168,000	11,976,000
November.....	1,761,000	1,911,000	3,736,000	3,226,000	13,912,000	1,580,000	17,393,000	5,674,000	36,802,000	12,391,000
December.....	1,673,000	2,002,000	3,693,000	3,276,000	13,735,000	1,773,000	17,587,000	5,503,000	36,688,000	12,554,000
1934										
January.....	1,632,000	2,047,000	3,630,000	3,346,000	13,706,000	1,817,000	17,069,000	6,043,000	36,037,000	13,253,000
February.....	1,646,000	2,037,000	3,830,000	3,153,000	13,942,000	1,596,000	17,177,000	5,958,000	36,595,000	12,744,000
March.....	1,632,000	2,054,000	4,029,000	2,961,000	14,075,000	1,479,000	17,458,000	5,700,000	37,194,000	12,194,000
April.....	1,676,000	2,014,000	4,197,000	2,800,000	14,045,000	1,524,000	17,695,000	5,486,000	37,613,000	11,824,000
May.....	1,981,000	1,713,000	4,284,000	2,720,000	14,001,000	1,583,000	17,890,000	5,314,000	38,156,000	11,330,000
June.....	2,245,000	1,462,000	4,253,000	2,758,000	13,898,000	1,702,000	17,911,000	5,315,000	38,307,000	11,227,000
July.....	2,106,000	1,595,000	4,066,000	2,951,000	13,839,000	1,776,000	17,652,000	5,597,000	37,663,000	11,919,000
August.....	1,960,000	1,745,000	4,010,000	3,014,000	14,001,000	1,630,000	17,544,000	5,728,000	37,515,000	12,117,000
September.....	1,940,000	1,768,000	3,911,000	3,120,000	13,750,000	1,896,000	17,803,000	5,492,000	37,404,000	12,276,000
October.....	1,896,000	1,816,000	3,836,000	3,202,000	14,075,000	1,586,000	17,911,000	5,407,000	37,718,000	12,011,000
November.....	1,859,000	1,856,000	3,811,000	3,234,000	13,957,000	1,720,000	17,760,000	5,581,000	37,387,000	12,391,000
December.....	1,642,000	2,077,000	3,904,000	3,148,000	13,971,000	1,721,000	18,041,000	5,323,000	37,558,000	12,269,000
1935										
January.....	1,395,000	2,328,000	3,962,000	3,667,000	13,912,000	1,795,000	17,393,000	5,993,000	36,692,000	13,183,000
February.....	1,341,000	2,385,000	4,160,000	3,906,000	14,001,000	1,723,000	17,436,000	5,973,000	36,938,000	12,967,000
March.....	1,392,000	2,338,000	4,253,000	2,820,000	14,001,000	1,737,000	17,479,000	5,953,000	37,125,000	12,848,000
April.....	1,608,000	2,126,000	4,304,000	2,771,000	13,957,000	1,796,000	17,739,000	5,716,000	37,613,000	12,409,000
May.....	1,832,000	1,905,000	4,290,000	2,796,000	13,853,000	1,916,000	17,686,000	5,783,000	37,670,000	12,400,000
June.....	1,993,000	1,743,000	4,203,000	2,890,000	13,809,000	1,975,000	17,739,000	5,762,000	37,749,000	12,370,000
July.....	1,988,000	1,757,000	4,197,000	2,903,000	13,779,000	2,020,000	17,568,000	5,958,000	37,530,000	12,638,000
August.....	2,028,000	1,720,000	4,253,000	2,854,000	13,942,000	1,873,000	17,566,000	5,981,000	37,789,000	12,428,000
September.....	1,964,000	1,783,000	4,306,000	2,805,000	14,104,000	1,726,000	17,890,000	5,679,000	38,267,000	11,998,000
October.....	1,967,000	1,788,000	4,508,000	2,613,000	14,104,000	1,741,000	18,063,000	5,529,000	38,642,000	11,671,000
November.....	1,839,000	1,870,000	4,564,000	2,564,000	13,927,000	1,934,000	18,084,000	5,531,000	38,464,000	11,899,000
December.....										11,700,000

RELIEF ESTIMATES

The Federal Government's estimates of people on relief are not available for 1936. This is for the reason that since last year the relief problem has been thrown back on the States. The Federal Government has gradually withdrawn from the picture, and the burden of direct relief is now upon the States. Apparently the sharp drop in the Government's relief estimates from November to December 1935 resulted from the Federal Government's withdrawal from the direct relief picture and the disbanding of the Federal Emergency Relief Administration, succeeded by the Works Progress Administration.

Number of families, cases, and persons, and percent of population receiving emergency relief, continental United States, by months, January 1933 through December 1935

[Division of Research, Statistics, and Records, Federal Emergency Relief Administration, Mar. 26, 1936]

Months and years	Resident families, cases, and persons receiving relief under the general relief and special programs					Transients (mid-month census)
	Number of families	Number of single persons	Number of cases	Total number of persons	Percent of total population ¹	
1933						
January.....	3,850,000	(²)	(²)	(²)	(²)	(²)
February.....	4,140,000	(²)	(²)	(²)	(²)	(²)
March.....	4,560,000	(²)	(²)	(²)	(²)	(²)
April.....	4,422,675	(²)	(²)	19,700,000	16	(²)
May.....	4,247,450	(²)	(²)	18,900,000	15	(²)
June.....	3,754,290	(²)	(²)	16,800,000	14	(²)
July.....	3,455,414	453,000	3,908,414	15,385,000	13	(²)
August.....	3,352,201	408,000	3,760,201	15,085,000	12	(²)
September.....	3,035,850	399,000	3,434,850	13,403,000	11	(²)
October.....	3,010,510	435,000	3,445,510	13,610,000	11	(²)
November.....	3,366,102	463,427	3,829,529	15,081,673	12	(²)
December.....	2,631,080	446,889	3,077,969	11,671,559	10	(²)
1934						
January.....	2,481,287	473,166	2,954,453	11,083,868	9	(²)
February.....	2,593,318	559,184	3,152,502	11,636,036	10	126,873
March.....	3,053,816	642,766	3,696,582	13,763,650	11	145,119
April.....	3,791,210	654,880	4,446,090	16,843,507	14	164,244
May.....	3,803,455	631,256	4,434,711	17,181,475	14	174,138
June.....	3,753,467	576,797	4,330,264	16,828,861	14	187,282
July.....	3,837,553	557,229	4,394,782	17,202,949	14	195,051
August.....	4,033,535	586,302	4,619,837	18,115,751	15	206,173
September.....	4,068,283	673,120	4,741,403	18,298,084	15	221,734
October.....	4,072,166	739,211	4,811,377	18,311,324	15	235,903
November.....	4,210,064	789,458	4,999,522	18,930,469	15	266,790
December.....	4,456,438	821,041	5,277,479	20,045,708	16	288,955
1935						
January.....	4,614,965	873,062	5,488,027	20,676,773	17	297,058
February.....	4,584,012	887,434	5,471,446	20,605,192	17	300,460
March.....	4,588,423	904,590	5,493,013	20,578,056	17	299,509
April.....	4,468,378	902,721	5,371,099	20,043,894	16	293,676
May.....	4,304,354	883,010	5,187,364	19,276,425	16	273,824
June.....	4,023,882	795,141	4,819,023	17,954,450	15	263,668
July.....	3,677,338	711,987	4,389,325	16,143,656	13	253,340
August.....	3,549,428	692,186	4,241,614	15,533,002	13	245,266
September.....	3,259,145	666,218	3,925,363	14,212,550	12	218,722
October.....	3,075,505	649,695	3,725,200	13,393,164	11	158,575
November.....	2,850,117	623,611	3,473,728	12,371,694	10	113,223
December.....	2,079,369	529,715	2,609,084	8,896,030	7	64,543

¹ Based on 1930 census of population.

² Partially estimated.

³ Not available.

NATIONAL UNION FOR SOCIAL JUSTICE PROGRAM

The entire 16-point program of the National Union for Social Justice is worthy of support. For years I have fought for these same principles. I wish to mention the 16 points, one by one, and call your attention to the fact that 4 points in Father Coughlin's program are recognized in the Frazier-Lundeen social-security bill.

1. I believe in the right of liberty of conscience and liberty of education, not permitting the State to dictate either my worship to my God or my chosen avocation in life.

This is a constitutional guarantee and must be upheld.

ADEQUATE UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

2. I believe that every citizen willing to work and capable of working shall receive a just and living annual wage which will enable him to maintain and educate his family according to the standards of American decency.

In the entire program of the National Union for Social Justice there is no plank more important than this. It recognizes a fundamental principle embodied in the Frazier-

Lundeen bill: That all capable and willing workers who are unemployed through no fault of their own shall receive a just and living income. Today millions of American citizens, capable and willing to work, are unemployed through no fault of their own. Each of these citizens must be guaranteed an American standard of living. Point no. 2 of the social-justice program guarantees these workers a fair living wage.

The Frazier-Lundeen social-security bill sets forth this same guaranty in practical legislation that has been approved by experts in the field. It has been endorsed by thousands of labor unions, church and fraternal societies, civic bodies, State and local governments. No man or woman who refuses to work can secure the benefits of the Frazier-Lundeen social-security bill. Provision is made for all who are capable of working and willing to work, unable to obtain employment.

PUBLIC OWNERSHIP

3. I believe in nationalizing those public necessities which by their very nature are too important to be held in the control of private individuals. By these I mean banking, credit, and currency, power, light, oil, and natural gas, and our God-given natural resources.

The Farmer-Labor Party has for years endorsed this demand, and I have fought for it in and out of Congress.

4. I believe in private ownership of all other property.

I am convinced that we must do all in our power to save the independent merchant and small business. They have helped to build this country. I am a member of the steering committee for the Patman-Robinson anti-chain-store bill.

5. I believe in upholding the right to private property, yet of controlling it for the public good.

The fairness of this plank is obvious.

CONGRESS SHOULD COIN AND REGULATE VALUE OF MONEY

6. I believe in the abolition of the privately owned Federal Reserve Banking System and in the establishing of a Government-owned central bank.

7. I believe in rescuing from the hands of private owners the right to coin and regulate the value of money, which right must be restored to Congress, where it belongs.

8. I believe that one of the chief duties of this Government-owned central bank is to maintain the cost of living on an even keel and the repayment of dollar debts with equal-value dollars.

These three points are essentially the Farmer-Labor program which we all advocate. Congress must take upon itself its constitutional duty to coin money and regulate the value thereof. Banking is a public not a private function. The poor have been made to care for the poor, while bonds and interest take care of the rich.

FRAZIER-LEMKE FARM-REFINANCING BILL

9. I believe in the cost of production plus a fair profit for the farmer.

This same plank forms a part of the Farmer-Labor platform. The farmer will never receive justice until he is given cost of production plus a fair profit.

In addition to cost of production for his products, the farmer must have a means of refinancing mortgages without paying tribute to large banking chains. The Frazier-Lemke farm refinancing bill is part of an intelligent farm recovery program. My name was fifth on the Frazier-Lemke petition to bring this bill before the House for a vote, and I worked to secure the signatures of other Members on that petition. I supported and voted for the Frazier-Lemke bill.

RIGHT OF LABOR TO ORGANIZE

10. I believe not only in the right of the laboring man to organize in unions, but also in the duty of the Government which that laboring man supports to facilitate and to protect these organizations against the vested interests of wealth and of intellect.

It is certainly the duty of government to protect labor's right to organize. I have supported every bill before Congress that strengthened the rights of labor.

OPPOSE TAX-EXEMPT SECURITIES

11. I believe in the recall of all nonproductive bonds and thereby in the alleviation of taxation.

12. I believe in the abolition of tax-exempt bonds.

Government securities, whether issued in the past or the future, should be taxed. The super-rich invest their excess

income in tax-exempt securities. They must not be permitted to dodge their just share of the tax burden. There is nothing new about this. I have advocated it for years. On June 29, 1935, I introduced a resolution (H. J. Res. 341) to permit taxation of tax-exempt securities.

LUNDEEN BILL TO TAX TAX-EXEMPT SECURITIES

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution, which shall be a valid part of the Constitution when ratified by the Legislatures of three-fourths of the several States:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. The Congress of the United States and the legislature of any State shall have the power, after the ratification of this article, to lay and collect taxes on gains, profits, and incomes, from whatever source derived, including gains, profits, and incomes derived from securities issued, whether before or after the ratification of this amendment, under the authority of the United States, the authority of any of the several States, and the authority of any subsidiary government of any State, including municipalities.

"Sec. 2. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified by three-fourths of the several States within three years from the date of submission hereof to the States by Congress."

TAX THE SUPER-RICH FOR SOCIAL SECURITY

13. I believe in the broadening of the base of taxation founded upon the ownership of wealth and the capacity to pay.

14. I believe in the simplification of government and the further lifting of crushing taxation from the slender revenues of the laboring class.

As a member of the Minnesota State Legislature from 1910 to 1914, and as a Member of Congress, 1917 to 1919 and 1933 until the present time, I have fought for higher taxes on gifts, inheritances, and incomes over \$5,000.

These points in the social-justice program are recognized in the Lundeen resolution to permit taxation of tax-exempt securities and in the Frazier-Lundeen social-security bill, which specifies that funds for social security shall be raised by taxation on gifts, inheritances, and incomes over \$5,000. Social security will have plenty of funds when we tax these sources of wealth.

IF YOU CONSCRIPT MEN FOR WAR, CONSCRIPT WEALTH FOR WAR

15. I believe that in the event of a war for the defense of our Nation and its liberties, there shall be a conscription of wealth as well as a conscription of men.

On April 6, 1917, I voted against America's entry into the World War. I voted against conscription for foreign service, and I said on the floor of the House on April 6, 1917, "If you conscript men for war, conscript wealth for war." That statement may be found on page 363 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the Sixty-fifth Congress, first session. Many organizations, including the American Legion, now stand where I stood alone in 1917.

If this point is carried out, it will help us stay out of foreign conflicts—conflicts which we do not understand. Why should we become involved in the quarrels of the Old World?

HUMAN RIGHTS ABOVE PROPERTY RIGHTS

16. I believe in preferring the sanctity of human rights to the sanctity of property rights. I believe that the chief concern of government shall be for the poor, because, as it is witnessed, the rich have ample means of their own to care for themselves.

The sanctity of human rights above property rights is the foundation stone upon which the whole social-justice program rests. It is the basis of the Frazier-Lundeen social-security bill, which proposes to tax the superrich to take care of the poor, the unemployed, the sick, and the aged. It is the firm foundation of our Farmer-Labor Party program. Governments are instituted to protect the weak and restrain the strong.

LUNDEEN MOTION ON THE PATMAN ADJUSTED-SERVICE-CERTIFICATE BILL

Another measure advocated by the National Union for Social Justice is not included in the 16-point program. This is the Patman adjusted-service-certificate—bonus—bill. This bill has been for years a part of the Farmer-Labor platform.

In 1933 the Patman bill was buried in committee. On April 27, 1933, I placed a petition on the Speaker's desk to get it out

of committee. For 10 months we worked until we secured the names of 145 Congressmen on that petition. It was on the Lundeen motion that the Patman adjusted-service-certificate bill was brought up for a vote on March 12, 1934, when it passed the House by an overwhelming majority. It helped to bring about the payment of more than \$2,000,000,000 to the veterans of the World War. I have supported payment of the adjusted-service certificates throughout the past two terms of Congress, and I placed the first bonus bill before Congress in 1919—a bill drafted by the Private Soldiers and Sailors Legion.

PERMANENT UNEMPLOYMENT SOLUTION

We will appropriate more billions of dollars for public works to put the unemployed to work at useful projects. I will vote for more appropriations for this noble purpose. But we can never permanently solve our unemployment problem until we have enacted into law a thoroughgoing planned program. We must guarantee security to the worker, cost of production plus a fair profit for the farmer, justice for the veterans of all wars, freedom from crushing monopolies and financial tyranny for all our citizens.

On August 17, 1935, I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the entire 16-point program of the National Union for Social Justice. This program is consistent with the platform and principles of the Farmer-Labor Party. Our program is based on the Christian principle that human rights are more sacred than property rights.

Surely the unemployment and relief situation demands vigorous action today, and surely we must act before we adjourn. I am opposed to adjournment of this Congress sine die until these vital principles have been enacted into law, to the end that America once again may know prosperity and happiness for all her people.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks to include therein extracts from certain unemployment records.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Contract air-mail service: For an additional amount for the inland transportation of mail by aircraft, etc., including the same objects specified under this head in the Post Office Department Appropriation Act, 1936, \$1,300,000.

Mr. DOBBINS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DOBBINS: Page 64, line 25, strike out "\$1,300,000" and insert "\$1,800,000, any unexpended balance thereof, not exceeding \$250,000, to be available during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1937."

Mr. DOBBINS. Mr. Chairman, this amendment, let me say, is very necessary if we are to maintain during the balance of the present fiscal year the Air Mail Service of this country at its present standard of efficiency.

The deficiency appropriation bill provides, for the Air Mail Service, \$1,300,000. Every cent of this amount is required for the retroactive increases in air-mail pay, which have been allowed by the Interstate Commerce Commission, and I am informed today by the Second Assistant Postmaster General that unless additional appropriations are made for the maintenance of this service for the current fiscal year, it is going to be necessary to reduce schedules on some of the lines in order to keep within the existing appropriation limits. This ought not to be done.

While air-mail travel is very rapid through the air, it is not going to do you any good to have this speedy service if you have to wait 24 hours from the time your letter is posted until the plane flies to carry your letter.

Mr. LUNDEEN. Would the figure the gentleman has proposed here keep up the present standard of efficiency or increase it?

Mr. DOBBINS. The figure proposed here will keep the service up for the remainder of the current fiscal year at its present standard of efficiency.

Mr. LUNDEEN. I think that should be done, I will say to the gentleman, and I would be in favor of an increase.

Mr. DOBBINS. A greater increase might well have been requested.

The sum of \$250,000, half of the additional appropriation proposed by my amendment, is required to keep the service up to its present standard of efficiency until July 1, and it is expected that \$250,000 will remain unexpended at the end of the current fiscal year which will allow for certain very much needed extensions of existing air-mail routes.

Our Air Mail Act of 1935 provided for a considerable amount of expansion and extension in the Air Mail Service of the country. It has now had a year's trial, and there are certain extensions needed and needed badly. Yet the appropriation provided for the next fiscal year was limited to the same amount as this year and would not have allowed any extension whatever.

I want to say for the special benefit of the members of the Appropriations Committee that this \$250,000 contemplated for next year, as proposed in this amendment, was approved by the Director of the Budget and was included in the Budget message, but was left out of the regular appropriation bill.

Our Air Mail Service has been conducted on a very efficient basis. We have decreased the cost of this service by many million dollars, notwithstanding that the revenues from the air mail for the present fiscal year are going to be a million dollars more than they were last year.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. DOBBINS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOBBINS. The Air Mail Service is going to increase. It is increasing in popularity more rapidly than any other feature of the service ever has gained in the public favor. The 6 cents you spend on an air-mail stamp, if you are sending a letter more than 1,000 miles, or more than 500 miles, is ordinarily worth a dozen special-delivery stamps, and you get that expedited service for 6 cents.

The public is getting to realize that fact. This added \$250,000 ought to be allowed.

I can say this—and I would rather not disclose my authority for the statement—that while \$250,000 of this proposed increase was included in the Budget message the other \$250,000 will not be objected to by the Budget. Without disclosing my source of information I predict that this sum or a greater increase will be included in the Budget next year. I hope the committee will adopt this amendment.

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, the committee is not unsympathetic with the purposes and efficiency of the air mail. The committee has allowed in this bill every penny that the Budget estimate called for. We have no knowledge of the need that the gentleman speaks about.

I will say that the Second Assistant Postmaster General, since we have been reading the bill in the House, did speak about the matter to me over the telephone. If we are to proceed in an orderly way, the Post Office Department must get a Budget estimate and have it sent to the Senate and included there. We cannot legislate by a Member getting up on the floor and saying that the Department needs another \$500,000 and just put it in the bill.

Mr. LUNDEEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM. Yes.

Mr. LUNDEEN. Has the Department requested this additional sum?

Mr. WOODRUM. Over the telephone.

Mr. LUNDEEN. Then, the Post Office Department has asked for it?

Mr. WOODRUM. I could be at the telephone all day and talk with the heads of departments and get requests for additional appropriations.

Mr. DOBBINS. The Budget did estimate for \$250,000.

Mr. WOODRUM. Yes; for 1937; and the Subcommittee on Post Office Appropriations cut it out during consideration of the regular 1937 supply bill, and the House sustained the action. Now, the gentleman wants us to put that amount

back in the deficiency bill. I hope the amendment will not be adopted.

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. The gentleman on the Appropriations Committee said that there is no reason advanced for the appropriation asked for in the amendment. I will give him some reasons. When the air-mail contracts were canceled, Tulsa had the largest airport in the world. We had five airlines through there, and this mix-up left us with one line from Dallas up to Oklahoma City, and then to St. Louis. For \$50,866, which could be used here, with the line already partly lighted from Kansas City to Tulsa, we can have a line extended from Kansas City down to Tulsa. The line already exists from Sioux Falls to Kansas City, the line being partly lighted from Kansas City to Tulsa. You ask us to come in an orderly way. We have approached every authority we know how to, to get this in. This is an orderly procedure, to do it by amendment here on the floor of the House. The Budget did recommend \$250,000, and the gentleman says that the House cut it out. Here is the place, here in the House, to get this back, and if you Democrats will let me address myself to you, I may say that if you want to help carry a doubtful district down there, help us out now. This is the first chance I have ever had to talk where money was involved.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DISNEY. This is the only way to do it, and there are other necessary extensions. I do not know the details of them, but I say to you that we have not had a fair chance any place, at any time, except here to have this appropriation, and we are entitled to it. I am confronted in my district with red-hot editorials, every other day, that the air service for my district has been debauched, and I am asking you to furnish relief to us by this amendment. Orderly procedure is for Representatives to ask the House in which they appear to pass the appropriation and give it to them. You know that the Interstate Commerce Commission has enlarged the rates, and there is bound to be some kind of a deficiency, and here is the place to give us that relief.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I feel that it is my duty to support the distinguished gentleman from Virginia, in charge of the bill, who prefers that this amendment shall not be adopted. I happen to be the chairman of the Subcommittee on the Post Office and Treasury Departments' Appropriations which prepared the bill for the fiscal year 1937. That bill already already has passed the House carrying appropriations of \$12,000,000 for domestic air mail. In the Senate that amount was raised, but in conference the Senate conferees agreed with the House conferees that our position is the correct position and the bill for the fiscal year 1937 as completed in conference carries \$12,000,000. The conference report has been adopted by the Senate. It is still pending in the House.

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. LUDLOW. Very well.

Mr. DISNEY. As a matter of fact the \$12,000,000 is \$250,000 less than the Budget agreed upon. Is not that correct?

Mr. LUDLOW. The Budget submitted an estimate of \$12,250,000, but our subcommittee considered it very thoroughly, and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DOBBINS] is in error, I think, when he makes the statement that \$12,000,000 would result in a restriction or an impairment of the service, because it was testified in the hearings before this deficiency subcommittee on page 561 that \$12,000,000 would maintain all existing service for the next fiscal year without any diminution of service.

Mr. DISNEY. I can furnish some information if the gentleman desires.

Mr. LUDLOW. But it was testified to by Mr. Jesse M. Donaldson, the Deputy Second Assistant Postmaster General.

Mr. DISNEY. In 48 hours from now the Post Office Department told me they would run into a deficit.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Donaldson appeared as the accredited representative of the Post Office Department, and I have in my hand his testimony, in which he said that that would maintain all existing service.

Mr. DISNEY. After the rates had been raised by the Interstate Commerce Commission?

Mr. LUDLOW. No. This pertains to the exact situation at the present time.

Mr. DISNEY. Another question, and I will quit. How on earth are we to get the air service we are entitled to except to come here and ask for it by an amendment?

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Donaldson testified as follows:

Mr. DONALDSON. If the Interstate Commerce Commission should raise no rates during the next fiscal year, and we would grant no increased schedules on the existing routes, holding the service to what it is now, and the volume of mail did not increase so as to make it necessary for us to run emergency or special schedules, we could probably come within the \$12,000,000. But in that \$12,000,000 there is not a dollar for any increased schedules, for emergency schedules, or for any extensions of existing service, or for any new service of any kind, and it does not include the \$300,000 involved in the case pending.

That is to say, that the existing service could be maintained by the amount allowed here.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes in order to clear this up.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. LUDLOW. The action of our subcommittee was unanimous. The Members on both sides of the table, politically speaking, believed that \$12,000,000 was sufficient to maintain this service. I wish to assert, and to emphasize, my great respect for Harlee Branch, the able Second Assistant Postmaster General, who has charge of air mail. There is no more conscientious or capable official in the Government service. He came before us and made a most impressive presentation of the needs of his Department. If we did not give him all the money his enthusiasm called for it was because we felt a duty in these times of depression to hew to the line of economy.

Under the law, the Interstate Commerce Commission must review these rates every year. The Interstate Commerce Commission, furthermore, on its own initiative may take up any route at any time for revision. The testimony all goes to show that these air-mail contractors are rapidly getting out of the red and into the black.

The mail is increasing; the passenger service is increasing; freight is increasing; their financial position is rapidly becoming very much improved. It was our thought that by maintaining the appropriation at \$12,000,000 it would give an incentive, at least, to the Interstate Commerce Commission to look carefully into these rates, with the possibility of some revision downward on account of the improved financial condition of these different contractors. We believed and we still are inclined to believe that \$12,000,000 is adequate, and that our position originally taken was correct. I have learned only today that the Second Assistant Postmaster General feels that the cut in domestic air mail may bring serious consequences. It was not in the minds of any of us to impair or penalize the service. As Mr. WOODRUM has suggested, the orderly procedure will be for him to present his facts and arguments to the Senate Committee on Appropriations, and I am sure that if he makes a good case the committee will give consideration to the adoption of an amendment to take care of the situation.

Mr. WOODRUM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUDLOW. I yield.

Mr. WOODRUM. May I direct the gentleman's attention to the fact that the amendment calls for \$500,000 for the balance of this fiscal year. This bill cannot possibly become law before the 1st of June and there would only be 1 month left, and it would be impossible to use it in that time.

Mr. LUDLOW. I thank the gentleman for that information. I was addressing myself especially to the fiscal year 1937, which our bill covered.

Mr. DISNEY. But, Mr. Chairman, that is not a true statement. It is not just for this fiscal year.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment, and all amendments thereto do now close.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has already recognized the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. DISNEY. The statement made by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] does not correctly reflect the facts.

Mr. WOODRUM. Let the amendment be reported.

Mr. DISNEY. Yes; that is satisfactory.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will again report the amendment.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DOBBINS: Page 64, line 24, strike out "\$1,300,000" and insert in lieu thereof the following "\$1,800,000, any unexpended balance thereof, not exceeding \$250,000, to be available during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1937."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 8. After June 30, 1936, advance payments under the provisions of section 601, title II, of the Legislative Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1933, shall have no longer period of availability for obligation than the appropriation from which such advance payments are made.

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WOODRUM: Page 100, line 2, strike out "section 601" and insert "title VI", and in the same line strike out the word "title" and insert the word "part."

The amendments were agreed to.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. McCORMACK, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill H. R. 12624, the deficiency appropriation bill, directed him to report the same back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded upon any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

By Mr. TABER: I move to recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same back forthwith with the following amendment: On page 21, line 10, strike out the paragraph and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That for the purpose of providing direct relief in the United States, its Territories, and possessions, and the District of Columbia, there is hereby appropriated the sum of \$1,425,000,000; and there is hereby reappropriated for the same purpose all unobligated and unexpended balances, with the exception of allotments to the Civilian Conservation Corps, of the amounts appropriated by the acts approved June 16, 1933 (48 Stat. 274); February 15, 1934 (48 Stat. 351); June 14, 1934 (48 Stat. 1055); and April 8, 1935 (Public Res. No. 11, 74th Cong.), and to remain available until June 30, 1937, to be allocated and disbursed by the President to the States, Territories, and possessions, and the District of

Columbia, for relief according to their respective need: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be allocated or paid to a State, Territory, or possession, or the District of Columbia, or subdivision thereof which shall not contribute an amount equal to at least 25 percent of the total proposed expenditures, both local and Federal, and shall not administer such expenditures by and through a nonpartisan board."

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, will the Speaker make the situation clear with reference to the legislative program for Monday?

As I understand it, it will be in order before we complete this bill to take up the question of the discharge of the Rules Committee from further consideration of the Frazier-Lemke bill. I would like to ask the Speaker if my understanding is correct, if consideration of the discharge petition would come up before the vote on this bill?

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks it would unless there is a previous understanding. The matter of which shall take precedence can be fixed by consent.

Mr. BOILEAU. I appreciate that, Mr. Speaker. Many Members interested in the Frazier-Lemke bill are anxious to know just what the situation is going to be.

Mr. SNELL. It would seem to me, if the Speaker will permit, that the vote on the pending bill would be the unfinished business before the House on Monday.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Wisconsin that, by consent, an agreement can be made whereby the vote on the motion to recommit the pending bill, or a roll call on its passage, can be had first, and then to take up the motion to discharge the committee.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOILEAU. Certainly.

Mr. BANKHEAD. As I understand the parliamentary situation, there can be only one vote on Monday on the matter of the Frazier-Lemke bill, and that is on the motion to discharge the committee.

Mr. BOILEAU. I thought there would be two votes. I may be in error, but I thought the first vote would be on the motion to discharge the committee and then automatically on the adoption of the rule if the House decided to discharge the committee.

Mr. BANKHEAD. If the gentleman will yield further, the rule provides that on the succeeding day after the vote to discharge the committee, in the event that motion prevails, that the bill shall be taken up.

Mr. BOILEAU. I hate to disagree with the gentleman from Alabama, but I think he is in error. The resolution provides that the bill shall be brought up on the following day.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Yes.

Mr. BOILEAU. The first vote we will have, as I understand it, will be on the motion to discharge the committee; then, if the committee is discharged from further consideration of the bill, automatically we will have a vote on the adoption of the rule.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks the gentleman is correct.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Be the understanding of the gentleman from Wisconsin as it may, it would provide for only 20 minutes' debate.

Mr. BOILEAU. That is right, on two roll calls.

Mr. BANKHEAD. There might be two roll calls. So if we could get permission to have the vote on the pending bill first, we could devote the remainder of the day to those two motions and roll calls.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, the rules provide very directly that we shall take up the rule immediately after the vote if the House adopts the discharge rule.

Mr. BANKHEAD. There is nothing possible except two roll calls on the bill now pending. I gave the gentleman some days ago the assurance that there would be no disposition on the part of Members on this side of the aisle to prevent your having full opportunity to consider the discharge rule and the motion to take up the Frazier-Lemke bill. This is just in the matter of expedition.

Mr. BOILEAU. With the assurance of the distinguished gentleman, I have no desire to object to his request, and with his further assurance that we will have cooperation of the gentlemen on that side, I withdraw my objection.

The SPEAKER. The whole matter may be arranged by unanimous consent if the House desires to do so.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I shall submit a unanimous-consent request when the pending one is acted upon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman from Alabama state what his unanimous-consent request will be?

Mr. TABER. The pending request is to adjourn over until Monday.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I will propound the other request when the pending one is acted upon. I will submit another unanimous-consent request and the gentleman may object if he sees fit to do so.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House meets on Monday the order of business shall be the motion to recommit the pending bill and the passage of the bill, and that thereafter the rule to discharge the Committee on Rules from consideration of the Frazier-Lemke bill shall be the next order of business.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

VETO MESSAGE OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—BANKERS RESERVE LIFE CO. OF OMAHA, AND WISCONSIN NATIONAL LIFE INSURANCE CO. (H. DOC. NO. 491)

The Chair laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States:

To the House of Representatives:

I return herewith, without my approval, H. R. 3155, "An act to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims of the United States to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of the Bankers Reserve Life Co. of Omaha, Nebr., and the Wisconsin National Life Insurance Co. of Oshkosh, Wis."

This bill confers jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims of the United States to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of the Bankers Reserve Life Co. of Omaha, Nebr., and the Wisconsin National Life Insurance Co. of Oshkosh, Wis., for a refund of income taxes paid by said companies for the years 1923, 1924, and 1925, in excess of the amount due, and pursuant to the provisions of section 245 (a) (2), Revenue Acts of 1921 and 1924, which section was subsequently held unconstitutional by the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of *National Life Insurance Co. v. United States* (277 U. S. 508), notwithstanding the bars or defense of any alleged settlement heretofore made or of res judicata, lapse of time, laches, or any statute of limitations. Suit thereunder is authorized to be instituted at any time within 4 months from the approval of this act, and proceedings in any suit brought in the Court of Claims under the act, appeals therefrom, and payment of any judgment therein shall be had as in the case of claims over which such court has jurisdiction under section 145 of the Judicial Code, as amended.

The bill would confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims notwithstanding the bars or defense of any settlement heretofore made or of res judicata, lapse of time,

laches, or any statute of limitations. Thus, regardless of any final agreements executed by the claimants pursuant to the provisions of section 1106 (b) of the Revenue Act of 1926, jurisdiction is proposed to be conferred upon the Court of Claims to redetermine tax liability for the years covered by any such agreements, and to render judgments for refunds. There appears to be no valid reason why the claimants in this case should not be bound by the provisions of said section 1106 (b) of the Revenue Act of 1926, as are other taxpayers and the Government.

The bill goes still further and deprives the Government of the defense of *res judicata*, although other taxpayers and the Government are subject to such defense.

The Court of Claims is also authorized to disregard the defense of the statute of limitations. The bill would authorize such refund notwithstanding the fact that a claim for refund thereof was not filed within the statutory period prescribed for filing such claim.

Recently there have been submitted to me other bills which proposed to except certain taxpayers from the operation of the statutes of limitations pertaining to the revenue laws by extending the time for the refunding of certain taxes to such taxpayers. On those occasions I expressed my accord with the enacted policy of Congress that it is sound to include in all revenue acts statutes of limitations, by the operation of which, after a fixed period of time, it becomes impossible for the Government to collect additional taxes or for the taxpayer to obtain a refund of an overpayment of taxes. I pointed out in each instance that legislation such as the proposed bill selects a small class of taxpayers for special treatment by excepting them from that policy. Such legislation thus discriminates against the whole body of Federal taxpayers and establishes a precedent which would open the door to relief in all cases in which the statute operates to the prejudice of a particular taxpayer, while leaving the door closed to the Government in those cases in which the statute operates to the disadvantage of the Government.

In this regard the present measure, H. R. 3155, does not differ in principle from any of the above-mentioned bills which were under consideration by me on those prior occasions. I am not aware of any circumstances which would justify an exception to be made in this case to the long-established policy of Congress. I must reiterate my belief that the field of special legislation of this character should not now be opened to relieve special classes of taxpayers from the consequences of their failure to file refund claims within the period fixed by law.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, May 8, 1936.

The SPEAKER. The objections of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the bill and the message be referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered printed.

The motion was agreed to.

VETO MESSAGE OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—JOINT MEMORIAL DAY SERVICES AT ARLINGTON NATIONAL CEMETERY AND OTHER CEMETERIES (H. DOC. NO. 492)

The Chair laid before the House the following further message from the President of the United States:

To the House of Representatives:

I return herewith, without my approval, H. R. 10388, a bill entitled "An act to aid the veteran organizations of the District of Columbia in their joint Memorial Day services at Arlington National Cemetery and other cemeteries on and preceding May 30."

This bill provides—

That the sum of \$2,500 be, and the same is hereby, authorized to be appropriated for the current and succeeding years to aid the Veterans' Memorial Day Corporation in its Memorial Day services and the decoration of the graves of all soldiers, sailors, and marines with flags and flowers in the cemeteries in the District of Columbia and in the Arlington National Cemetery in Virginia.

SEC. 2. That said fund shall be paid to the treasurer, or his successor or successors in office, of the Veterans Memorial Day Corpo-

ration, organized under the laws of the District of Columbia on or about November 17, 1928, and shall be disbursed by him or them for said memorial services, flowers, and flags: *Provided*, That no part of said fund be expended for salaries or compensation for services rendered by any member or officer of said corporation.

I do not feel justified in giving my approval to this bill for the following reasons:

It specifically authorizes appropriations in aid of the "Veterans Memorial Day Corporation" and provides that "said fund shall be paid to the treasurer, or his successor or successors in office, of the Veterans Memorial Day Corporation, organized under the laws of the District of Columbia on or about November 17, 1928." I am informed that no corporation of this name exists in the District of Columbia, and even if this bill were approved and an appropriation made in furtherance thereof, the Treasury Department would be unable to pay over any moneys because of this fact.

The Federal Government furnishes and maintains burial grounds for its veterans, furnishes each grave with a properly inscribed headstone, and, on Memorial Day, places an American flag at the foot of each grave. While sentiment properly favors the placing of flowers on the graves of those who have defended their country, it seems clear that if the Federal Government were to undertake this in the District of Columbia it would obviously be extended in future years, and at large cost, to the graves of all American veterans in the eighty-odd other national cemeteries in the United States, in Mexico, in France, in Belgium, and in England.

I am confident that a more personal and living commemoration would be maintained if in the future, as in the past, the many organizations of veterans of our former wars, in cooperation with other citizens, continue their responsibility for placing flowers on the graves of our veterans.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, May 8, 1936.

The SPEAKER. The objections of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal.

Mr. MAVERICK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the message and the bill be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered printed.

The motion was agreed to.

GREAT LAKES EXPOSITION—1936

Mr. LAMNECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution (H. J. Res. 547) providing for the importation of articles free from tariff or customs duty for the purpose of exhibition at Great Lakes Exposition to be held at Cleveland, Ohio, beginning in June 1936, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the House joint resolution, as follows:

House Joint Resolution 547

Resolved, etc., That all articles which shall be imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the international exposition to be held at Cleveland, Ohio, beginning in June 1936, by Great Lakes Exposition, or for use in constructing, installing, or maintaining foreign buildings, or exhibits at the said exhibition, upon which articles there shall be a tariff or customs duty shall be admitted without payment of such tariff, customs duty, fees, or charges under such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe; but it shall be lawful at any time during or within 3 months after the close of the said exposition to sell within the area of the exposition any articles provided for herein, subject to such regulations for the security of the revenue and for the collection of import duties as the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe: *Provided*, That all such articles, when withdrawn for consumption or use in the United States, shall be subject to the duties, if any, imposed upon such articles by the revenue laws in force at the date of their withdrawal; and on such articles which shall have suffered diminution or deterioration from incidental handling or exposure the duties, if payable, shall be assessed according to the appraised value at the time of withdrawal from entry hereunder for consumption or entry under the general tariff law: *Provided further*, That imported articles provided for herein shall not be subject to any marking requirements of the general laws, except when such articles are withdrawn for consumption or use in the United States, in which case they shall not be released from customs custody until properly marked, but

no additional duty shall be assessed because such articles were not sufficiently marked when imported into the United States: *Provided further*, That at any time during or within 3 months after the close of the exposition any article entered hereunder may be abandoned to the Government or destroyed under customs supervision, whereupon any duties on such article shall be remitted: *Provided further*, That articles which have been admitted without payment of duty for exhibition under any tariff law and which have remained in continuous customs custody or under a customs exhibition bond and imported articles in bonded warehouses under the general tariff law may be accorded the privilege of transfer to and entry for exhibition at the said exposition under such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe: *And provided further*, That Great Lakes Exposition shall be deemed, for customs purposes only, to be the sole consignee of all merchandise imported under the provisions of this act, and that the actual and necessary customs charges for labor, services, and other expenses in connection with the entry, examination, appraisal, release, or custody, together with the necessary charges for salaries of customs officers and employees in connection with the supervision, custody of, and accounting for articles imported under the provisions of this act, shall be reimbursed by Great Lakes Exposition to the Government of the United States under regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury, and that receipts from such reimbursements shall be deposited as refunds to the appropriation from which paid, in the manner provided for in section 524, Tariff Act of 1930.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 2, line 19, after the word "general", insert the word "tariff."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROTECTION IN REVERSE

Mr. CHRISTIANSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a radio speech which I delivered this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHRISTIANSON. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech which I delivered over the radio this afternoon:

This afternoon I shall discuss the tariff policy of the present administration and its effect on agriculture. I begin by quoting Mr. Roosevelt. In a speech at Baltimore in October 1932, when he was a candidate, he said: "It is absurd to talk of lowering duties on farm products. . . . I know of no effective excessively high tariff duties on farm products. I do not intend that such duties shall be lowered. To do so would be inconsistent with my entire farm program, and every farmer knows it and will not be deceived."

Certainly no one could make a more definite promise. It was unequivocal; it left no loopholes.

The farmers of the country took the candidate at his word and helped pile up the big vote by which he was elected President of the United States.

Looking back upon 3 years of Mr. Roosevelt's administration, what do we see? What is the record of performance? The tariff structure has been gutted, and there is hardly an agricultural schedule left that has not been seriously impaired.

From the standpoint of the farmer, the most destructive of all the reciprocal-tariff agreements was the one with Canada, which went into effect January 1. It reduced the duty on cream from 56.6 to 35 cents a gallon, and on Cheddar cheese from 7 to 5 cents a pound; on dairy cattle weighing more than 700 pounds, from 3 to 1½ cents a pound, and on beef cattle of the same weight, from 3 to 2 cents a pound. The tariff on calves weighing less than 175 pounds, on hay, and on apples, was lowered 40 percent. These are only a few of the reductions. Poultry, seed potatoes, and maple sugar; alfalfa, sweetclover, and timothy seed—the importation of all these was facilitated by the trade pact with Canada.

And let it not be overlooked that the concessions Canada received under this agreement are not limited to Canada alone. Every country that has a treaty with the United States calling for most-favored-nation treatment—which means every country in the world except Germany—can demand the same terms. Every time we make a trade agreement with one country, every time we pull out one brick, we bring down a whole section of the tariff wall.

It is significant that in the month of January—the first month the trade agreement with Canada was in force—the imports of Canadian cheese were 12 times as large as those of January 1935. The imports of poultry during the same period increased tenfold; of potatoes, elevenfold; of cattle, twelvefold. We imported 2½ times as much bacon and ham, 3 times as much milk powder, 6 times as much fresh beef, 17 times as much fresh

pork, and 22 times as much wool, from Canada in January 1936, as we did in January 1935. The number of Canadian horses brought into this country increased from 15,315 to 98,500.

A few comparisons between all agricultural imports for the first quarter of this year and those for the first quarter of last year will prove interesting. Our total imports of canned meats doubled. Our imports of pickled pork increased three and one-half fold; of hams, shoulders, and bacon, eightfold; of fresh pork, fivefold; of poultry, fivefold; of milk, three and one-half fold; of condensed milk, fourfold; of dried and malted milk, sixteenfold, and of hogs, one hundredfold.

These things didn't just happen. They were the result of the policies of a President who promised not to lower agricultural tariffs, and kept his promise by opening our markets to all the world.

They were the result of writing tariff schedules in star-chamber sessions presided over by a free-trade doctrinaire, the present Secretary of State, in which the people most concerned have no opportunity to be heard and in which their interests are given scant consideration, instead of in the Congress of the United States, where issues are debated openly and publicly, by representatives of the people who must go back to the people at regular intervals for approval of their records.

The present administration has fastened upon the country a procedure that is undemocratic, unconstitutional, un-American, and unsound; and by that procedure it has deprived the American farmer of what is his due—a fair chance to supply the American market with American products grown on American land.

What the farmer should know is that his interests are being bartered away in order to secure concessions for industry. The manufacturers of automobiles, trucks, tractors, and farm machinery have fully exploited the home market and are looking for increased outlets abroad. They have motorized and mechanized America—now they must motorize and mechanize the world. The policies of the present administration are a concession to industrial greed. Those policies sanction and support the folly of sacrificing the buying power of farmers at home in order to provide buying power for farmers in Canada and Argentina—a purpose as stupid and shortsighted as that of the dog in Aesop's fable, who lost the bone he held in his mouth in trying to get the bone of another dog he saw reflected in the water.

The industrialist, if he were wise, would see that his interests would be best promoted in the long run by foregoing export outlets gained at the expense of the American farmer. If the industrialist can't see it, if he can't control his rapacity, the Government, which represents all the people, should see it; and should chart its course in such a way as to achieve a balance of agriculture and industry—a prosperous farm population capable of absorbing the production of busy factories, and thriving industry furnishing employment to millions of men and women, who in turn would be able to supply a profitable market for the products of the farm.

In order to achieve that balance, agriculture must be given the first call on the foreign market, the first chance to supply the wherewithal to balance the trade account with those foreign countries from which we buy what we do not ourselves produce.

The chief purpose of foreign trade is to accomplish an interchange of raw materials; the accomplishment of that purpose should be the first objective in our economic planning. Give the farmer opportunity to supply the home market and to pay for such noncompetitive agricultural raw materials as we must import, such as rubber, silk, sisal, tea, coffee, and cacao, and we shall be done with subsidies, acreage reduction, and the other dubious devices to which we have of late resorted—temporary expedients improvised to "relieve" 30,000,000 farm folk who would neither need nor ask relief if we only gave them justice.

The present administration promised the farmer protection. It has given him protection—in reverse. Its tariff policy has been designed to give away his home market to competitors who had already crowded him out of his foreign market.

To ask the American farmer to reduce his own acreage and then invite farmers abroad to increase theirs in order to make up the difference, and finally to open wide our own doors for the reception of the foreigners' increased production—that doesn't make sense. It may be a New Deal, but it is not a square deal.

I hope I shall not seem too partisan if I close by saying that what the American people most need, and should most desire just now, is a square deal—a square deal from a new deck!

FOLDING SPEECHES AND PAMPHLETS FOR THE SENATE

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. J. Res. 260) to provide an additional appropriation for folding speeches and pamphlets for the Senate for the fiscal year 1936.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

Senate Joint Resolution 260

Resolved, etc., That for folding speeches and pamphlets, for the Senate, at a rate not exceeding \$1 per thousand, there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$4,000 for the fiscal year 1936.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE SISSON BILL

Mr. MAVERICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by including a radio address delivered by the gentleman from California [Mr. SCOTT].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAVERICK. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include the following address of Congressman BYRON N. SCOTT, of California, broadcast from Washington, D. C., over a Nation-wide hook-up of the National Broadcasting Co., Friday May 8, 1936:

Last year when the House and Senate approved the conference report in the District of Columbia appropriation bill, they approved at the same time a piece of legislation that has been the cause of considerable discussion ever since. Many of us did not know we were approving in this conference report a proviso that hereafter no part of the money appropriated for schools in the District could be used to pay the salaries of teachers teaching or advocating communism.

I hold no one but myself to blame for allowing this measure to go through unopposed or unpublicized. I, of course, did not know the proviso was in the bill. I should have known it. But that is water over the wheel. It is a law. Now I want to help undo the mistake I made last year and help to repeal this provision.

I do not believe the provision was or is necessary. The school teachers of the United States, the school teachers in the District are not Communists. They are not trying to indoctrinate communism. Dr. Ballou is an outstanding example of the high professionalism of American educators. The members of the District Board of Education are splendid specimens of American citizenship. It almost seems silly to me to find it necessary to make this defense for them against the slanderous, stupid charge that they are indoctrinating our schools with communism. If you knew these people, you would realize immediately that the charges are fatuous and my defense redundant. This applies likewise to the entire teaching personnel of the Nation.

I do not believe the legislation is having the effect professedly desired by its authors. They are seeking to prevent the spread of communism in the District and in the Nation. Movements of this kind thrive on publicity and persecution. The so-called "red rider" has given more aid and comfort to this movement than anything that has happened in recent years.

I think the legislation endangers the civil liberties of all people, including members of the teaching profession. Without impugning the motives of the authors of the legislation, I call their attention to the fact that they have, I trust, unconsciously, played into the hands of a subversive, un-American group determined upon the throttling of freedom of expression, freedom of thought, and freedom of speech. This subversive element is seeking to terrorize the teaching profession, so that the schools may in time be forced to indoctrinate the subversive propaganda of the Fascist element that is growing in our country. As alders and abettors of this subversive practice the proponents of this legislation are guilty of being accessories both before and after the act. Those who propose this regimentation of opinion, those who insist on this terrorization of teachers, those who thus plan to scuttle the schools, are likewise the most persistent enemies of the attempts of the present administration to bring social and economic justice to those who have so long been denied those rights. It is the strategy of special privilege to brook no criticism, and by a reign of terror to force all molders of public opinion to serve their cause. The "red rider" is a strong weapon in the hands of this subversive element in its present reign of terror. Those who, by intuition, logic, or tradition, champion the cause of civil liberties should easily recognize in this academic restriction a threat to our democracy.

I think the legislation is a gratuitous insult to the teaching profession of America. This woefully underpaid, overworked, much-maligned group of loyal, patriotic men and women that has suffered so much from the malicious attacks of yellow journalism and their silly sycophants is entitled to the respect and defense of every right-minded, decent American. I think we would do much better to pay our respects to the school teachers than to pay lip service to their enemies, or to pay into the hands of this subversive element seeking the sabotage of American liberty and democracy.

I think the legislation is ambiguous. It says no teacher may receive a salary if that teacher has taught or advocated communism. Now, no good teacher advocates anything in the classroom. They are not advocates and must not be forced to become so. This legislation would put them into the business of advocacy. That would be very harmful to our system of education. Since the legislation would force teachers to become advocates of the status quo, the legislation should be repealed. The scientific method of investigation for progress must be maintained.

The legislation says that teachers must not teach communism. What is communism? Some well-known daily papers have called

certain high officials of our own Government, Communists. Does this mean that the speeches and writings of these individuals could not be quoted in the classrooms? Would the teachers be forced to refuse to tell students what our Government is doing?

The chief advocate of this legislation has declared war on all those officials of the Government who, according to his definition, are tainted with communism or radicalism. He has referred to a book called the Red Network as an authoritative source book on communism and Communists. He uses this book to prove certain well-known professors in certain well-known colleges and universities are Communists. He would ban their writings from the libraries. He would refuse to teachers the right to quote these books in the classroom. If he accepts the Red Network as an authority on the subject on Communists, he must accept it in toto. If he accepts as authoritative the charge that the teachers mentioned are Communists, then he must charge that the others mentioned are also Communists. He must insist that their writings and speeches be barred from the libraries. If all people mentioned in his authoritative source, the Red Network, are dangerous radicals, then under the terms of this legislation these people may not be quoted, their remarks may not be discussed by District teachers.

Let me pick some names at random. These people and their works are on the blacklist: Jane Addams, of Hull House fame. No teacher of sociology would dare quote from her voluminous and authoritative writings. Oscar Ameringer, the American Guardian who would have to be banished from the libraries; Thomas R. Amle, Congressman from Wisconsin; William E. Borah, Senator from Idaho (newspapers carrying his speeches would have to go); ex-Senator Brookhart, Senator Costigan, of Colorado, ex-Senator Dill, of Washington, Senator Frazier, of North Dakota, Senator La Follette, of Wisconsin; Senator Norris, of Nebraska.

The inclusion of these names in the Red Network would, if we followed the letter of the law, take the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD out of the libraries, as subversive propaganda:

Sherwood Anderson; Norman Angell; Newton D. Baker; Harry Elmer Barnes; Carleton Beals; Charles A. Beard (the Rise of American Civilization would have to go); Supreme Court Justice Brandeis and his dissenting opinions; Heywood Brown and his column in the daily news; Earl Browder, of course; S. Parkes Cadman; Stuart Chase, Father James R. Cox; Clarence Darrow; John Dewey; William E. Dodd, Ambassador to Germany; John Dos Passos; Theodore Dreiser; Sherwood Eddy; Albert Einstein; Edward A. Filene; Irving Fisher; Harry Emerson Fosdick; Glenn Frank; Felix Frankfurter, professor at Harvard Law School; Zona Gale; Mahatma Gandhi; Maxim Gorki's books; Mrs. J. Borden Harriman; Fannie Hurst; Robert M. Hutchins; Harold L. Ickes, Secretary of the Interior; Edward Keating; the entire La Follette family; the mayor of New York City; Sinclair Lewis; J. Ramsay MacDonald; H. L. Mencken; Edna St. Vincent Millay; Alla Nazimova; the Governor of Minnesota; Elmer Rice; Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt (would her column "My Day" be barred?); Margaret Sanger; George Bernard Shaw; James T. Shotwell; Lincoln Steffens (his autobiography would be consigned to a dark closet); Leopold Stokowski; Lorado Taft; Hendrik Willem Van Loon; Oswald Garrison Villard; James P. Warbasse, president of the Co-operative League of America; William Allen White—of all people; Rabbi Stephen S. Wise; Miss Mary E. Woolley.

There are many more just as well known whom I do not have time to mention. I have named these for one reason. The chief proponent of this "red rider" claimed there was communism in the schools of the District because a man mentioned in this book was a consultant on character education. He wanted this man and his books barred. Evidently he wants the works of all those mentioned in this book, which he calls authoritative, barred. What is this? Are we, in the twentieth century, to have an index?

In a system of free education in a democracy, who should determine methods and aims of education? Should we have this decision in the hands of those who have dedicated their lives to education for citizenship, and spent years in training for this profession, or should we turn it over to some penny politician from the prairie?

Am I not right in calling this thing absurd? Are we not making ourselves ridiculous in the eyes of thinking, intelligent people?

The Honorable FRED J. SISSON, of New York, has introduced a bill providing for the repeal of the "red rider." It has been heard and reported by the District Committee. It will come up for debate and action on its merits on the next District day. We must look to the Speaker of the House when we are asked, "Will there be another District day this session?"

Every lover of liberty, every defender of the decent, every enemy of subversive action should write in a demand for another District day. The sooner the better.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FORD of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address given over the National Broadcasting Co.'s network on Friday, May 1, by A. P. Gianini.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, who is the man who made the speech?

Mr. FORD of California. He is the head of the Bank of America.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I object to that, Mr. Speaker.

GOVERNMENT IN THE TERRITORIES

Mr. DIMOND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include a radio address I made some time ago.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alaska?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIMOND. Mr. Speaker, under leave given to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address which I delivered over the radio on March 11, 1936.

Ladies and gentlemen, the subject so ably presented by Senator Gibson in the address which he has just made is one of outstanding importance. As he told you the plan embraces the creation of a new governmental department under a Cabinet head having supervision over all matters concerning the Territories and island possessions. Greater representation for the Territories and insular possessions is demanded not only for the welfare of the people residing therein, but more especially for the welfare of the 125,000,000 of people who reside in the several States of the Union.

It must be obvious even to those who know little, if anything, of the political status or economic development of the several Territories and insular possessions that the settlement and development and exploitation of the resources of those regions bring marked economic benefits to the people of the United States. Let me give an example as to the Territory which I represent in Congress as Delegate, the Territory of Alaska.

Alaska was acquired from Russia in 1867. Little was done with respect to the settlement or an investigation of the resources of the Territory until 1897, though for some years before that time salmon canneries had been operated in Alaska on a small scale. However, since 1867, the value of the fisheries of Alaska has exceeded a billion dollars. The Territory has produced furs of the approximate value of \$125,000,000; minerals, principally gold and copper, in excess of the value of \$700,000,000, including about \$453,000,000 in gold. During that period the total exports of the Territory have reached the approximate value of \$1,900,000,000 and its total imports during the same period have exceeded \$990,000,000.

It is apparent from the figures just mentioned that although Alaska contains at the present time only about 62,000 inhabitants, it has been a source of very considerable wealth, not so much to the people of Alaska as to the people of the United States. This last conclusion is proved by the excess of exports over imports. An examination of the imports into Alaska from the United States and the exports from Alaska to the United States during the last 15 years has shown that the average yearly excess of exports over imports has reached the sum of \$33,000,000. If the United States as a whole produced an exportable surplus in proportion to its population, it would have had during the same period the enormous exportable surplus of more than \$66,000,000,000 each year.

And yet, administratively, Alaska is split up among the various departments of the Government in such fashion as to make impossible the best type of administration. Recently I had occasion to inquire as to the jurisdiction of the several departments over the hundreds of islands fringing the coast of Alaska, and I find that in 1913 all of the islands of the Aleutian chain, including Unimak and Sanak Islands on the east and extending to and including Attu Island on the west, were reserved and set apart for the preservation and breeding of native birds, for the propagation of reindeer and fur-bearing animals, and for the encouragement and development of fisheries, and jurisdiction was given to the Department of Agriculture, except as to the fisheries. Later, in 1928, the jurisdiction over a part of the islands of this group was transferred to the Department of the Interior. And to this day it is impossible for the average citizen to see why authority over some islands should be under one department and over others under another. As we come down to the eastern part of Alaska we find the jurisdiction over these islands and all matters concerning them, except the fisheries, to be in the Forest Service, or, as to game, in the Bureau of Biological Survey, in the Department of Agriculture. Each department is quite eager, and, indeed, insistent, upon maintaining its own jurisdiction and in preventing any other department from acquiring any part of that jurisdiction.

Obviously a concentration of authority under a Cabinet head in the Government will bring nearer the solution of the problem. It is to be remembered in this connection that the Constitution extends and applies to the Territories with full force and effect, and the unification of authority under one head such as a Cabinet minister would not and could not in any manner deprive the people of Alaska, or the people of Hawaii, of their constitutional rights.

In the past we have had the experience of one Cabinet member favoring the development of the Territories and island possessions, and the adoption of a liberal policy with respect thereto, finding his efforts largely negated by another Cabinet member exercising some jurisdiction over affairs in the same regions.

The situation at the present time is very much improved by the recent erection in the Department of the Interior of the Division of Territories and Island Possessions, under the able leadership of Dr. Ernest Gruening, with a small staff of capable assistants. The creation of this Division has to some extent enabled a correlation of administrative agencies and has led

to a unity of administrative policy not before known. The difficulty lies in the lack of authority in this new Division.

If for practical purposes all administrative jurisdiction were placed in a Cabinet head of rank equal to that of other members of the President's Cabinet, we should inevitably have a more nearly complete concentration of administrative power and a much greater degree of harmony in administrative policy with respect to the Territories and island possessions.

The proposal of Senator Gibson to create a Cabinet post for the Territories and island possessions is wise and statesmanlike, and the sooner it is adopted the better, not only for the people residing in the Territories and possessions but for the people of the United States as a whole.

Good administration everywhere requires—and, indeed, demands—the concentration of administrative power and authority in one head, for only thus can efficient action be taken and only thus can responsibility be fixed.

Accompanying this unity of Federal administrative authority should be a delegation of greater power of home rule, as to Alaska at least. The people of Alaska should be granted full control of their fisheries and of their fur and game. Such local control would lead to a better administration than exists at present and would also give the people of the Territory valuable experience in self-government and governmental administration.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. MEAD, for 2 days, to attend a funeral.

To Mr. ELLENBOGEN, for 5 days, on account of death in family.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. PARSONS, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 3823. An act for the relief of the parents of Albert Thesing, Jr.;

H. R. 11035. An act making appropriations for the military and nonmilitary activities of the War Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1937, and for other purposes;

H. R. 11098. An act to provide for terms of the United States District Court for the Middle District of Pennsylvania to be held at Wilkes-Barre, Pa.;

H. R. 11994. An act to provide for the establishment of a term of the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Oklahoma at Shawnee, Okla.; and

H. R. 12098. An act making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice and for the judiciary, and for the Departments of Commerce and Labor, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1937, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 381. An act for the relief of the Confederated Bands of Ute Indians located in Utah, Colorado, and New Mexico;

S. 1075. An act for the relief of Louis H. Cordis;

S. 3645. An act for the relief of Dampskib Aktieselskab Roskva;

S. 3685. An act for the relief of George Rabcinski;

S. 4395. An act for the relief of the State of New Jersey;

S. 4447. An act for the relief of J. L. Summers.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 4 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned to meet, in accordance with its previous order, on Monday, May 11, 1936, at 12 o'clock noon.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. MILLER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 12219. A bill to dispense with unnecessary renewals of oaths of office by civilian employees of the executive departments and independent establishments; without amendment (Rept. No. 2597). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BLAND: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. S. 3467. An act amending the Shipping Act, 1916, as amended; with amendment (Rept. No. 2598). Referred

to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. DALY: Committee on Claims. H. R. 10846. A bill to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and enter judgment upon the claims of contractors for excess costs incurred while constructing navigation dams and locks on the Mississippi River and its tributaries; with amendment (Rept. No. 2599). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland: Committee on Claims. S. 3818. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to consider, ascertain, adjust, and determine certain claims for damages resulting from the operation of vessels of the Coast Guard and Public Health Service; with amendment (Rept. No. 2600). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. RAYBURN: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. S. 4023. An act to provide for the continuation of trading in unlisted securities upon national securities exchanges, for the registration of over-the-counter brokers and dealers, for the filing of current information and periodic reports by issuers, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2601). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ROGERS of Oklahoma: Committee on Indian Affairs. S. 3452. An act to amend an act entitled "An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to arrange with States or Territories for the education, medical attention, relief of distress, and social welfare of Indians, and for other purposes"; without amendment (Rept. No. 2603). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GEHRMANN: Committee on Indian Affairs. S. 4298. An act to authorize an appropriation to pay non-Indian claimants whose claims have been extinguished under the act of June 7, 1924, but who have been found entitled to awards under said act as supplemented by the act of May 31, 1933; without amendment (Rept. No. 2604). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GEARHART: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. House Joint Resolution 444. Joint resolution to amend the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution authorizing the Federal Trade Commission to make an investigation with respect to agricultural income and the financial and economic condition of agricultural producers generally", approved August 27, 1935; with amendment (Rept. No. 2605). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. GEHRMANN: Committee on Indian Affairs. H. R. 12622. A bill for the relief of Dr. Harold W. Foght; without amendment (Rept. No. 2602). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. RAYBURN: A bill (H. R. 12646) to amend section 318 of the Communications Act of 1934; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12647) to amend sections 210 and 602 (b) of the Communications Act of 1934 with respect to the issuing of franks and rendering of free service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DOXEY: A bill (H. R. 12648) to establish and promote the use of standard methods of grading cottonseed, to provide for the collection and dissemination of information on prices and grades of cottonseed and cottonseed products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FERNANDEZ: A bill (H. R. 12649) to authorize Production Credit Associations to make loans to fur trappers; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DOCKWEILER: A bill (H. R. 12650) to amend title II of the National Housing Act by adding a new section, to be known as section 208; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HAINES: A bill (H. R. 12651) to classify clerks in certain post offices of the third class; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. CARTER: A bill (H. R. 12652) to provide for the registration of aliens, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. LEA of California: A bill (H. R. 12653) for the creation of a Fuel Research Unit, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CONNERY: Resolution (H. Res. 505) providing for the consideration of H. R. 12285, a bill to rehabilitate and stabilize labor conditions in the textile industry of the United States; to prevent unemployment and to provide minimum wages, maximum hours, and other conditions of unemployment in said industry; to safeguard and promote the general welfare; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DOBBINS: Resolution (H. Res. 506) proposing to amend clause 14, rule X, and clause 14, rule XI; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SHORT: Resolution (H. Res. 507) calling on the Postmaster General for facts concerning allegation that postal inspectors did not cooperate with agents of the Department of Justice in the capture of certain alleged mail robbers; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, resolution (H. Res. 508) calling on the Attorney General for facts concerning allegation that postal inspectors did not cooperate with agents of the Department of Justice in the capture of certain alleged mail robbers; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. LAMBETH: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 583) authorizing the Veterans' Administration to prepare and publish a compilation of all Federal laws relating to veterans of wars of the United States; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. BURDICK: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 584) to prohibit the sale of bonds and obligations of the kingdom of Italy within any territory of the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. KNIFFIN: A bill (H. R. 12654) for the relief of the Northwestern Ohio Mutual Rodded Fire Insurance Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MILLARD: A bill (H. R. 12655) for the relief of Marjorie L. Baxter; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. REED of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 12656) for the relief of Roy E. Vix; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

10855. By Mr. ANDREW of Massachusetts: Petition of 286 custodial employees of the Post Office and Treasury Departments of Boston, Mass., urging the passage of House bill 7267, to reclassify salaries of certain employees in the Customs Service and Post Office and Treasury Departments; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

10856. By Mr. CULKIN: Petition of Townsend Club, No. 1, of Carthage, N. Y., signed by 80 members, favoring the Townsend old-age-pension plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

10857. By Mr. KRAMER: Resolution of Local No. 1594, National Federation of Post Office Clerks of Huntington Park, Calif., relative to opposing all forms of discrimination against active union men in the Postal Service, etc.; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

10858. By Mr. MERRITT of New York: Resolution of American League Against War and Fascism, Jamaica Branch, comprising 56 citizens and residents of the Borough of Queens, city and State of New York, in meeting assembled, urging the defeat of the McCormack-Tydings disaffection bill (S. 2253) as being an un-American and unnecessary measure, which is a wanton assault on the freedom of the press and of speech and on our traditional rights of immunity against unreasonable search and seizure; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

10859. Also, resolution of the Board of Supervisors of the County of Westchester, N. Y., urging the President of the United States to set aside the sum of \$80,000,000 from the \$4,880,000,000 or other moneys to be appropriated by Congress for public works for the rehabilitation and construction of National Guard armories throughout the United States; to the Committee on Appropriations.

10860. Also, resolution adopted by the Queens County Council, Veterans of Foreign Wars, in meeting assembled on March 16, 1936, providing that the Congress of the United States pass immediately legislation requiring the registration of aliens in this country, and the fixing by Congress of a small fee for each registration to cover the cost of the work required, and further making it a Federal offense, punishable by immediate expulsion and the forfeiture of all properties, for the alien to fail to appear for registration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

10861. By Mr. SUTPHIN: Petition of Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, Local 192, of 53 New Street, New Brunswick, N. J., urging that the Works Progress Administration be expanded so as to put to work a greater number of unemployed; to the Committee on Appropriations.

10862. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the American Cotton Manufacturers' Association; to the Committee on Ways and Means.